

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 13 September 1989

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott

The Hon. B.C. Eastick

Mr G.A. Ingerson

Mr I.P. Lewis

The Hon. R.G. Payne

Mr P.B. Tyler

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: The procedure will be relatively informal. I will notify changes to composition of the Committee as they occur. If the Minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard* and two copies must be submitted no later than Friday 29 September to the Clerk of the House of Assembly.

I will take a flexible approach in giving the call for answering questions based on about three questions per member and alternating sides. I also allow supplementary questions, where appropriate, and introductory statements as we go through the various divisions of the votes. Subject to the convenience of the Committee, members who are outside the committee but who desire to ask a question will be permitted to do so once the line of questioning on an item has been exhausted by the Committee. An indication in advance to the Chairman will be necessary. Questions must be based on the lines of expenditure as revealed in the Estimates of Payments. However, reference may be made to other documents, for example, Program Estimates, the Auditor-General's Report, etc.

Auditor-General's, \$4 334 000

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Chief Secretary.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T. Sheridan, Auditor-General.

Mr P. Deegan, Administration Officer.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I do not wish to make an opening statement. I notice in the provision of funds for the Auditor-General's Department and the other documentation which has been made available to us, more specifically the Auditor-General's Report to the House on operations to 30 June 1989, that page 4 states:

A high level of recruitment has again been necessary as a result of the number of people leaving the department. In the past 12 months 16 officers have transferred to other State Government agencies or resigned to work in private enterprise.

The document also highlights the fact that there has been an integration of effort as between the Auditor-General's Department and business, with an exchange of officers from the Auditor-General's Department going into the corporate areas for experience. I am particularly concerned about this

high percentage, which is reaching almost 20 per cent of staff who leave a very vital and critical area of Government service that reports directly to the Parliament. I would like to know from the Minister or his advisers whether there has been any attempt to quantify or determine why this movement has been happening. What steps are in place or may be necessary to correct this unfortunate trend?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As a department we are not so concerned about the high turnover of younger people. The department recruits extensively in August for university graduates and, to date, we have been able to attract the brightest applicants. It is gratifying to know that the brightest of graduating students at the University of Adelaide actually seek positions with the Auditor-General and forgo more lucrative positions with private auditing firms. They find that Government auditing is innovative and creative work which broadens their general experience as auditors. After they consider that they have adequate experience, such officers then seek positions in private enterprise. Indeed, I would surmise that some are head-hunted. For the Government this means that it is getting a continual supply of bright young people who are being trained and, whilst they are going through their training period, we are getting the benefit of their knowledge and experience. We do not see it as a minus but as part of our corporate responsibility in assisting the Australian community.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I can appreciate what has been indicated, but I am concerned about the trend and the failure to retain people to provide continuity in departments. That is really the thrust of the report given to Parliament. Notwithstanding that one cannot hold people to any job for an indefinite period, considering the statements made in other areas of Government service, it is time to look at providing, particularly in respect of tertiary education, an incentive to people to stay in positions that are vital to the Government. Has that alternative been considered for the Auditor-General's Department?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It would be fair to say that that alternative has been considered in respect of the accounting profession throughout the Government as a whole. The member for Light would understand that accountants are in short supply now. There is a high demand for people in that profession. The position may be similar to that relating to geologists who, a number of years ago, were in short supply and who are now in oversupply. It is being considered by the Government as a whole. There was a report on financial management and questions were asked in respect of DPIR, another department for which I am responsible, concerning training, and the salary aspect will also be addressed. I ask Mr Sheridan to supplement my comments.

Mr Sheridan: I support in broad terms what the Minister has said. Two aspects are involved. There is no doubt that we are experiencing a high turnover. It is not much different from the turnover that has been experienced in other Government audit offices in Australia, or in private firms. We have been fortunate (and we work hard at it) in attracting good people into the system from the universities and colleges. These people are attracted by a number of things: the type and scope of work and the training that we offer, which is an important feature. In the past six months we have had to lift the level of salaries that we offered in order to compete because of the shortage and because of other people making demands in those areas.

Certainly it causes a small problem. If we had a situation where there was no movement in the office, it would cause a problem also because people would be locked into auditing, and whilst that is very interesting, particularly the value for money work that we do and the wide scope of the work,

we need to have in that sort of operation a turnover of staff. Sometimes 20 per cent is a bit high, but we need a turnover to keep people coming through the system, to keep it mobile. It is working all right and I am satisfied with the way it is operating provided we can maintain getting those good young graduates in from the universities and colleges, and I see no reason why we cannot do that.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: At page 2, under 'Management Approach', the report states:

However, a high rate of staff turnover, which has run at an average of 21 per cent over the last five years, has placed considerable pressure on existing resources and has resulted in a reduction in the age and experience profiles of staff within the department.

First, it is very clear that the high turnover has concerned the Auditor-General as the manager of the whole department. The comments by the Minister and the Auditor-General suggest that it has not been denied proper consideration. However, it has to be watched very carefully. The report also states that there is a '... continued emphasis on staff training'. I would appreciate from the Minister or the Auditor-General the relative costs of providing this staff training and what effect it has on effective employment time in the field of auditing. Is it in-house during work time or is it additional to work time? Is it entirely internal or to what degree does it make use of external expertise?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask Mr Sheridan to supplement my answer. First, we need to appreciate that, if an organisation does not provide funds for training, that organisation will operate very inefficiently and will finish up not being in business. Studies overseas have shown that the more profitable and efficient manufacturing companies employ an enormous amount of training in the first six months of employment. There is no reason to have different approaches to training in the manufacturing enterprises from those used by the Auditor-General or an accountancy firm. We will have to take on notice the cost of training aspect. The majority of that training is internal. About 15 per cent of the training time is conducted by consultants engaged specifically for a particular purpose.

Mr Sheridan: We attach a considerable amount of importance to the training of our staff for the very good reason (as the honourable member mentioned a moment ago) that, with the turnover, the level of experience has fallen, but it is being matched by the quality of the people we are getting in. That is why I make the point in the report that, as long as we continue to do that, we will handle the situation that needs to be carefully managed. Staff development is a very important part of the operations of the department. We run a variety of courses and, as the Minister said, we get outside assistance to do some of them. They range across a whole spectrum—they are not just all related to auditing.

They are related to management, financial management, computing and report writing. Our people engage themselves in examinations of auditees, personnel relations and other such matters to give a rounded development program to the people who work in the office. We regard that as very important. I am led to understand that it is one of the things that attracts the graduates into our office, and it is working successfully. I do not know the exact amount. We will take that on notice, as the Minister suggests, and provide that figure to you. However, it is a substantial part of our exercise.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Page 6 of the Report on the Operations of the Auditor-General's Department states:

Major value for money audits conducted during 1988-89 indicated that improvements could be achieved in the following areas:

- human resource and financial management;
- asset utilisation;
- application of information technology;

- quality of proposals and information upon which approval decisions are based;
- project control and management.

It is then stated that such information appears throughout the Auditor-General's Report. Has the Minister who is responsible for the conduct of the Auditor-General's Department or, alternatively, the Auditor-General issued to departments any information about the particular deficiencies that are seen to occur in the departments that require those specific dollar-costing matters to be addressed? I appreciate that throughout the Auditor-General's Report comments are made about major deficiencies. I take it that the information that is supplied on top of page 6 is a matter of degree in each individual department, and therefore may require different actions to get the best result from the comment or direction.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes. The major recommendations for the departments are in the Auditor-General's Report but two, I think, are not, and they will be reported to the Parliament when completed.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Page 4 of the Report on the Operations of the Auditor-General's Department refers to keeping abreast with developments in computing technology. Will the Minister expand on that? I understand that this is a fairly difficult area to encompass because of the outstanding pace of the developments that are occurring in information technology.

Mr Sheridan: As the honourable member correctly says, it is a very difficult area to keep on top of and up with. It changes almost weekly, if not daily. Over the past four years we have introduced into our operation some fairly inexpensive but sophisticated computing equipment. It flows from a word processor system and a fairly powerful computer in the office down to PCs with individual auditors out in the field. The department has a small data processing group of four people and they have had quite a deal of experience in data processing and computer processing.

They keep in touch with their counterparts interstate in the other Government audit offices. They have fairly close contact with people in the private area of computing, and keep themselves abreast of the sort of packages which are available in the commercial world and which will help in the data processing scene. From time to time they attend conferences. In fact, one of the members of that section, together with one of my field officers, attended a data processing conference in New Zealand earlier this year. Whilst I do not yet have the full report on that, I am told that quite a number of useful things came out of that from which we can benefit.

It is an area that we must keep on top of. Every Government agency now has at least part, if not pretty well all, of its operation on computer, and we must keep up in terms of the equipment, the training and the knowledge of the sort of package which is around and which can assist not only in our operation but also in the Government's operation.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It is a wise move on the part of this or any department to have a core group with the responsibility for staying abreast of changes in that area. I have relations in the computer field and, from time to time, I hear outstanding revelations from them about developments in this area.

I listened earlier to an explanation of the fairly high turnover in the department. Is that turnover due to some officers not being able to cope with the need to introduce and use more information technology in the field of auditing than in the past?

Mr Sheridan: No, that is not the reason for the high turnover. I find that the people in my department are pretty

computer literate. They are not leaving for that purpose. They are leaving, first, to further their own career opportunities, which they see in a variety of places. Although I could not tell you how many, a significant percentage of the 20 per cent have left to go to other public sector organisations. I believe that that is good, because, in part, I see the Auditor-General's office as a training ground for people in financial management and data processing and management generally, which I believe can be useful in the wider public sector. If they are going into the public sector, I think that is good, but they are not leaving because of computer technology.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note in the first paragraph on page 5 the following reference:

This includes an amount of \$168 000 for fees charged but not received as at 30 June 1989.

Is there any indication of some difficulty in recovering that amount, or is it simply a chronological statement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There is no difficulty in receiving those amounts of money. It is because the Auditor-General's statement is made on a cash basis. The honourable member will find amounts of money received in one financial year are due from a previous financial year. Consequently, accounts rendered prior to the end of the financial year are yet to be collected. If there was accrual accounting, it would show up as liabilities and assets.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The practice in some private firms is to bill ahead of time—in effect, to try to confine these operations and to speed up the cash flow by bringing them into the financial year during which the expense was incurred. Does that occur in Government practice?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that that happens to some extent, but my personal experience is that, while some people might want the money, they do not get it until they have provided the service. That is a reasonable method of payment. The problem arises when people are late paying.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On the page following the Auditor-General's signed statement to Parliament dated 5 September 1989 there is a heading 'Accountability—The Fundamental Elements'. I believe that all members appreciate the importance of the accountability aspects of financing, more specifically financing from Government sources. The Auditor-General stated:

That interest is being driven by a public which is becoming more concerned about Government activity and is demanding to be assured that:

- moneys they provide to Government by way of taxes and charges are being spent in accordance with the law and on the purposes for which they have been provided.
- the relationship between the taxes and charges paid and the community services provided reflects value for money.

The Auditor-General went on to say that that is not a new demand but is the basis upon which the Westminster system was developed. The Auditor-General made a further pertinent comment:

If (as, the case in some public sectors) the Auditor-General is not the appointed auditor of those subsidiary bodies then the financial accountability chain of the Westminster System is broken. This applies also where a Government chooses to appoint a private sector auditor, rather than the Auditor-General as the appointed auditor of a public enterprise.

I suggest that those statements would not have been made unless the Auditor-General had a latent or positive concern that all might not be well in the totality of auditing of Government accounts. Am I reading more into the statement than I should, or will the Minister or the Auditor-General expand further on this clear message to Parliament?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will not accept the honourable member's invitation to respond to that question, because it has nothing to do with the matter before the Committee

today: it is more to do with the Auditor-General's Report, which was tabled in Parliament on the last sitting day. That matter would be better raised in the context of Parliament through questions without notice or questions on notice.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: To whom?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I would imagine to me as the Chief Secretary.

Mr LEWIS: Then the Auditor-General answers to Parliament, not to Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Given the gratuitous advice of the member for Murray-Mallee, perhaps the Auditor-General should not be present at all. I make clear that we are here to examine the accounts and the budget, not the Auditor-General's Report. The matters raised in the Auditor-General's Report, including those in the preface, would be best questioned in Parliament. There are several ways to do that, first, through questions without notice or, secondly, through questions on notice. I will be happy to arrange for those matters to be raised. I invite the member for Light to follow that course.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: To say that I am disappointed would be an understatement. The Auditor-General is responsible to the Parliament, not to the Minister. The one occasion in the year when the Auditor-General has the opportunity to present or expand his views to the Parliament is before this Committee. If the Minister wishes to gag the Auditor-General—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is obvious. If the Minister wants to gag the Auditor-General from expanding on his report to the Parliament, be it on the Minister's head. Without taking the matter further, I suggest that I asked a legitimate question on a matter that has been drawn to the attention of the Parliament through the Estimates, which provide \$4 334 000 for the conduct of the audit system and the provision of services across the parliamentary ambit. The salaries of the staff who undertake the audit are contained within the estimates and the work performed by them relates to the question posed.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Chief Secretary—and not the Auditor-General—is here to be examined. The Auditor-General is in attendance to provide advice from time to time as to how the money allocated on page 542 of the Program Estimates may or may not be spent. I would imagine that, if it so desired, Parliament would devise some way for the Auditor-General to be examined on his report, as provided for under parliamentary procedures. However, I understand that today the Chief Secretary, rather than the Auditor-General, is being examined on the expenditure within the department.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is the Chief Secretary totally satisfied that there are no difficulties in the auditing system provided by the department under his control and as highlighted in the very clear message given to members of Parliament by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice from the Auditor-General is that, if the member for Light reads the whole page, he will establish that the bottom line is that the Auditor-General is also satisfied.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In providing a service to the various departments, the Auditor-General and his officers require those departments, in a number of cases, to qualify their financial statements with footnotes. In relation to the Auditor-General's examination of the Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia, a footnote which appears at the bottom of page 284 of the report states:

LGFA Securities Pty Ltd. A wholly owned subsidiary company, LGFA Securities Pty Ltd (formerly Hurlprey Pty Ltd), has been

registered with a paid up capital of \$2 and will be utilised, when appropriate to supplement the financial activities of the authority. No operations were undertaken by the company during the financial year under review. That authority interest in the company is included in the accounts as an investment.

Is the use of \$2 paid-up capital companies a common feature in auxiliary organisations such as the finance authority and is there a potential danger to the State's finances or the traditional Westminster system as a result of the fact that \$2 companies are now apparently looked upon as part of Government financing?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am well aware of the member for Light's interest in local government affairs. I suggest that his question should be directed to the Minister of Local Government. The matter that is being examined here today relates to the Chief Secretary and the proposed budget and expenditure for the 1989-90 year for the Auditor-General's Department and not local government. It is inappropriate for the question to be answered by me.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I take it that the Chief Secretary is indicating that he, as the Chief Secretary, is not averse to \$2 paid-up companies being a vital part of Government financing.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I refer the member for Light to my previous answer.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to page 547 of the Program Estimates, I understand that the Auditor-General can respond to requests for assistance in special investigations or other matters. What particular public sector subsidiary bodies are not under the control of the Auditor-General and what sort of financial accountability is the Chief Secretary prepared to undertake in relation to Parliament?

Mr Sheridan: All the Government departments, statutory authorities and the subsidiary bodies attaching to those statutory authorities that are in my annual report which was tabled last Tuesday are subject to the audit of the Auditor-General. Some of those have been brought to conclusion in the previous financial year, but they are all audited by the Auditor-General. I must correct that slightly and say that is so other than in the case of the South Australian Finance Trust which operates some subsidiary companies overseas in London and Hong Kong. I do not have the legal power to audit those, but I have a close relationship with the auditors of those overseas bodies. I have access to all their working papers and to the scope of the audit. I can ask for more work to be done if I feel that it is necessary.

Mr LEWIS: Page 547 of the Program Estimates states:

The department also assisted the board of the Adelaide Convention Centre in the establishment of an accounting framework and management reporting system for their operations.

Why, who pays, and how many other instances of similar advice have been given to quangos during the previous 12 months?

Mr Sheridan: We did provide that help and advice to the Adelaide Convention Centre and we worked with the centre's people in relation to this matter. We all agreed that it was necessary and the accounting framework and the management reporting system is now in place. In addition, people are also in place to continue running it. I suppose that was in the early days of the establishment of the Convention Centre. The work we did was additional to our normal audit and was reflected in the fee that was ultimately charged to them, so it got back to the Adelaide Convention Centre.

We have also provided help and advice in the past year to the E&WS and the State Services Department, both of which have transferred their operations into a business-type operation. For the first time this involved the establishment and preparation of a new set of accounts, involving a balance sheet in both cases. We provided assistance in each

instance. If we believe that the amount of time provided is significant enough, it would be reflected in the charges to those departments for the 1989-90 year.

Mr LEWIS: I take it from that comment that the Auditor-General is now acting as a consultant to a number of Government departments and/or quasi autonomous Government agencies to assist them in setting up an appropriate framework for books of account and so on. In their interpretation of the Act, do the Minister and the Auditor-General believe that that is countenanced by the Act? Was the Auditor-General meant to become a consultant?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask the Auditor-General to respond.

Mr Sheridan: This matter was raised in our previous Report on the Operations of the Auditor-General's Department to Parliament where we set down our objectives. One objective is to contribute to the quality of public sector management. We believe that that is an important function of the audit office, particularly in some cases where we have high turnover of accounting staff in some departments and where we have some agencies which are small and which do not have the capacity to employ the sort of financial advice that they need at times. We offer that advice.

It does not impinge on our independence as auditors, and we ensure that it does not do that. We offer advice and it is entirely up to the Government agency—in this case the Adelaide Convention Centre—whether or not it adopts that advice. It is its decision. We do not say, 'You must do it.' We give that advice, and we see that as part of the auditing function. It is no different from going into an agency and testing its system and controls and saying, 'These controls are not working, and you have a loophole in the control system.' We do not say, 'The control system is not working.' We say, 'It is not working, and this is what we suggest you might do to overcome it.' Unless an Auditor-General and his staff go that second step, one needs to question whether or not they are doing their job properly. It is something coming more and more into the fore in Government auditing, and probably that is the case in the private sector also. There is some management responsibility.

Mr LEWIS: I do not question the wisdom or veracity of the judgment to do as is being done, and as is being done apparently on an increasing basis. My question simply relates to the necessity or otherwise of members to amending the Act establishing the Auditor-General. I wish to ask a separate question now. Have South Australian Government departments yet adopted the practice of posting their reports electronically to the Auditor-General? If some have and others have not, I seek a break-down of which departments are so doing at present, which are not and when the rest will be able to do so. Already we can post our income tax returns by this technology to the Taxation Department with the assurance that they will be dealt with that much more quickly. There is good reason why that is so and it is relevant to the context of my inquiry here.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That is the carrot. The reason is that it is so much more efficient. I acknowledge the interjection, though it be out of order, from the member for Mitchell. It is so much more efficient. It saves the department rekeying all the information into a computer for analysis, and I am curious to know whether it is being done and, if it is not being done, why it is not being done. I believe it would improve substantially the efficiency with which the department can function, and thus enable a more appropriate and detailed scrutiny of what is going on with the existing resources allocated by Parliament and, in particular, this Committee, in scrutinising the vote today of a bit over \$4

million. My last comment is that I do not see any impediment to the electronic posting of reports compared to hard copy, and the sooner it is done the better it will be for everyone's point of view.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The answer is 'Yes'. It is happening where the facilities and capabilities of the departments allow it to happen. As the use of computers is expanded within accountancy and as the experience of departments is gained in this area, it will continue.

Mr LEWIS: Can you provide a list to the Committee?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will take the question on notice. The Auditor-General will supplement what I have said.

Mr Sheridan: It is happening in a couple of ways, but principally in one way. As I mentioned earlier, we have some sophisticated computing equipment now in the office and people out in the field have personal computers that they carry around. All our computing equipment is interconnected so that people in the field with their PCs can talk to our equipment in the office in King William Street.

Mr LEWIS: That is through electronic interface?

Mr Sheridan: Yes. Also, our equipment can talk to the Government Computing Centre equipment and the PCs in the field can also talk to that equipment. If we want to examine pay-roll information at the Government Computing Centre, we can tune into the centre—and this is what we generally do—and we can offload information from the files into our office and we can then examine it. We use this method increasingly for much analytical work on spread sheets and making comparisons of information between years or months, or between different organisations, and that helps us with the work that we do by getting it done better and more quickly, and also in some of our value for money assignments, to see whether there might be an area that needs to be looked at. The short answer is, 'Yes, we do it.' As to the word 'reports' which I take to mean the financial statements at the end of the year, we do not transfer them by computer, because they have to go to hard copy somewhere along the line. It has to come from the agency, but we use fax machines to get it backwards and forwards.

Mr LEWIS: My last question is a consequence of that. Why can the hard copy not be substituted by a magnetic tape held in the library by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Whilst I acknowledge that interjection, I acknowledge that it misses the point of my question altogether: one can still use one's eyes and brain, if one has any, to look at the figures held on record and magnetic tape by simply plugging it in and reading the record from the screen. If the Auditor-General's Department does not keep a copy at least on magnetic tape or a similar device to go back to, it is possible that a misdemeanour in reporting (I am not saying that anyone is trying to con anyone) not picked up in the initial scrutiny could be rectified and covered up by a department.

If it was left in the mainframe of the department or its records, its integrity cannot be assured. Is the Auditor-General presently provided in these lines with sufficient funds to retain library records in the forms to which I have alluded in order to ensure that there is integrity in the record?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes, and he does.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It is not often that one sees the sort of statement that appears on page 544 of the Program Estimates where it states in the table at the top, 'Inter-agency support services not paid for'. I would have thought that that would upset the Auditor-General. What takes place

in relation to that line, because increases are provided in both recurrent (it is a fairly large increase in terms of percentage) and capital? Somebody must pay for it; that is my point.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is work that is being done for the Auditor-General's Department by Sacon, and Sacon will provide the payment for it because it is within the building. The Auditor-General leases the building and accommodation from Sacon.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I will have to think about that matter. On page 546 under Specific Targets/Objectives for 1988/89, it states:

Quality of audit planning and audit work was maintained and emphasis continued to be given to value for money auditing.

Further, it states:

Contributed to the development of accounting and auditing standards through providing comments on exposure drafts issued by the professional accounting bodies.

What does that mean?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the Auditor-General to respond to that technical question.

Mr Sheridan: The two professional accounting bodies in Australia, the Australian Society of Accountants and the Institute of Chartered Accountants, have established a body called the Australian Accounting Research Foundation, would be responsible (and has been for a few years) for developing financial, management and accounting standards with which the private and public sectors comply. The Accounting Standards Review Board is also part of that and, in some cases, it gives legal backing to some of the standards developed by the research foundation. As part of the research foundation procedures in developing those standards, they are, when developed but before they are issued, sent around to a number of people both in the private and public sectors for comment to make sure that the standard that is about to be promulgated will be workable in the workplace. We take quite a deal of time, particularly where they affect public sector operations (as most of them do), to make sure that they are workable in the workplace. That is the nature of that matter to which the honourable member has referred.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In the knowledge that a number of authorities require a reporting period of 31 December rather than 30 June, resulting in those bodies having to report for two different accounting periods, and the considerable difficulty and cost that that causes, has any serious attempt been made to try to direct or determine that there be a universal common reporting date which would greatly reduce the cost to the community and overcome the difficulties experienced by those bodies? As a simple example, the Roseworthy Agricultural College must report by 31 December; however, in all other ways it has to make a different set of reports for different dates.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that very few report on other than 30 June, and no attempt has been made to change to another date those few that do not report on 30 June.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In relation to accrual accounting, which has been alluded to in an answer to a question by the member for Mitchell, to what degree is it progressing and how many organisations have proved their accounting or reports on an accrual basis, only to have the accrual accounting method withdrawn at the eleventh hour at considerable cost and frustration to them? I have no doubt of the commitment of the Auditor-General to accrual accounting, which is referred to at page xxv of his report, however, some organisations have proceeded along the line towards accrual accounting but, at the eleventh hour, have been told they must go back to the traditional method of reporting

because accrual accounting will not be accepted for the year to 31 December.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am aware of the situation to which the member refers. I can advise that statutory authorities, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and State Services report on an accrual basis. I know that several others will go to accrual accounting, including the Department of Marine and Harbors, for which I am responsible, and that in a short period of time we will see more departments and authorities doing likewise.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: By way of completing the reference to the Auditor-General, a brief statement at page 1 of the report on operations states, 'Independence is essential if that opinion is to be given in a full and forthright way.' I take this opportunity on behalf of the Parliament, but certainly on behalf of the Opposition, to thank the Auditor-General—if this in fact is his last appearance before an Estimates Committee, although that might only be speculation by the press—for the forthright way in which he has carried out his duties throughout the years on behalf of the community of South Australia and the Parliament. I express the hope that the very important issue which he raises will be foremost in the mind of his successor, who will occupy the position that he has occupied, to South Australia's advantage, for a number of years.

Mr Sheridan: Thank you very much for those kind comments, without acknowledging any other matters.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Until the recent redistribution of portfolios, the Chief Secretary's line was responsible not only for the Auditor-General but also for matters relating to daylight saving and universal time. Do those other two issues still rest with the current Chief Secretary?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Is the Chief Secretary able to advise the Committee whether the Government has completed its arrangements in bringing daylight saving into line with Eastern State activities, as was promulgated by his forebear?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is a policy matter that is better suited to go before the Parliament; it is not an expenditure matter. In due course the member for Light, I suppose, will ask that enlightened question when Parliament resumes.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Personnel and Industrial Relations,
\$10 855 000

Works and Services, Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations, \$1 327 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott
Mr S.J. Baker
Mr G.A. Ingerson
Mr I.P. Lewis
The Hon. R.G. Payne
Mr P.B. Tyler

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Labour.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr A.J. Strickland, Commissioner for Public Employment and Chief Executive Officer, Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations.

Mrs S. MacIntosh, Director, Policy and Support Services Division.

Mr G. Zapcev, Manager, Support Services.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Does any member wish to make a statement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes, Mr Chairman. The key priorities for the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations in the 1989-90 financial year reflect the Government's commitment to the social justice strategy and to improving the management of employees in the public sector.

The major initiative for 1989-90 is the youth employment program, where significant additional funding of approximately \$1.8 million has been provided. This initiative will allow the public sector to recruit and train a total of 300 additional young people in a range of occupations and in diverse public sector environments.

Also, as part of the Government's social justice strategy there will be additional resources of approximately \$986 000 provided to continue and expand a range of programs designed to improve opportunities for Aborigines. These programs include entry and recruitment schemes, training and development opportunities as well as a range of support services for existing Aboriginal employees. The ongoing development and support for Aboriginal employees will be a key focus in 1989-90 to ensure improved retention and improved promotional opportunities. The Commonwealth is jointly funding the programs and approximately \$500 000 will be provided in this financial year.

The August 1989 National Wage Case decision provided for wage increases to be granted 'for completion of successful exercises under the structural efficiency principle'. At this stage it is not clear what the parties to award negotiations will have to do to satisfy the commission that sufficient progress has been made to justify the awarding of the first increase. This will become clearer as specific proposals are put to the commission and decisions handed down. However, there are fundamental reviews of awards in progress with a view to further improving productivity and efficiency and to give employees access to more varied work and greater training opportunities. The Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations is regularly meeting with major unions to progress these reviews. Funding for the programs related to these activities for 1989-90 have therefore been increased above the actual expenditure level of 1988-89.

In 1988-89 the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations completed a corporate strategic computing plan. Following a further feasibility study for a joint computing facility with the Department of Labour a joint facility will be acquired which will meet the corporate computing needs of both agencies. The capital funds for this purpose are included in the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations program papers for 1989-90. The capital funds provided for the joint project in 1989-90 are \$1.3 million, and recurrent funds of approximately \$41 000 have also been provided.

As part of the overall budget process some areas of the department will have a reduction in resources. These adjustments will occur mainly in the area of support services to ensure service delivery to clients is maintained or enhanced wherever possible. The Treasurer has approved a number of changes in presentation at the sub-program level for the department. These changes reflect, first, a review of the activities previously included in support services to ensure that departmental activities that are part of other program

activities are shown in these programs; and, secondly, a new accounting structure designed to improve cost centre management and directly link the corporate planning and review process to program performance budgeting, which has highlighted areas that required adjustment. These adjustments include changes within all the major programs, the more significant changes in resource allocation being in staffing of the Public Service, personnel management improvement and intra-agency support services.

Mr S.J. BAKER: First, I believe that it would have been appropriate for officers in the Minister's department to discuss the timing of the consideration of these lines. Given that the first item on the agenda was the 'Labour' line and not the DPIR line, it would have been appropriate to discuss our schedule.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask that all members address their remarks through the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: No-one contacted me. I checked with my colleague the member for Light, and he had informed a person in the Minister's office that he would deal with the Auditor-General's line between 11 a.m. and 12 noon and that the member for Bragg and I should be approached in relation to the arrangements for the rest of the day. However, I was never contacted. I think it would have been proper for someone to have done so, as has occurred in the past.

My second point concerns yesterday's publicity about the obvious effort that was made by at least one Minister to ensure that Committees were weighed down with Dorothy Dix questions. I trust that that will not occur in this Committee.

My first question relates to program one. I note that 60 persons were involved in an early retirement scheme in 1988-89. What was the payout for those 60 persons and how many are expected to take up early retirement for 1989-90?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In the previous financial year, 160 people had offers made to them, of whom 127 accepted the offers. The total cost was \$3 359 349. As for the cost in the current financial year, it would be extremely difficult to predict as we do not know how many people have had offers made to them.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Just the numbers expected.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is the same. We anticipate about the same order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that page 519 of the Program Estimates, under Specific Targets/Objectives for 1988-89, states:

A number of desirable amendments to the Government Management and Employment Act have been identified.

Will the Minister detail the areas of reform the Government will be instituting?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If you read further, under 1989-90 Specific Targets/Objectives, that is what will be done.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It refers to 'desirable amendments to the Government Management and Employment Act.' With all due respect to the Minister's answer, I have read the 1989-90 Specific Targets/Objectives, and amendments are not actually canvassed there. What are the areas of amendment the Minister believes are desirable?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Until such time as Cabinet approves any amendments to the Government Management and Employment Act and they are introduced into this Parliament, I will not make any comment nor canvass any proposals, because they will be misconstrued by the Opposition.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the Government felt that changes were necessary, it could have highlighted the areas and said that the changes were proceeding and we would be moving into the 1990s in considering some of these areas—but it is all confidential. My third question relates to a very strange reference under the 1989-90 Targets/Objectives as follows:

Provide training to support the application of privacy legislation.

Will the Minister tell this Committee exactly which privacy legislation is referred to and why we need training to support it? Also, what is the nature of that training?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Act was passed through Parliament last year on the initiative of the Attorney-General and referred to the access to information held in respect of Government employees. There needs to be training of persons engaged in divulging that information to the people to whom it is to be divulged. I should have thought that the member for Mitcham would appreciate that it is very desirable that people be skilled in ensuring that information meant to be confidential is kept confidential and made available only to the people to whom it is meant to be made available and not spread about the community.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What specific areas of training are we referring to? Are we to give people legal training or will we get a long list of things that must remain confidential and train people to remember that list? How do we train such people and how many people will be trained?

Mr Strickland: They will be trained in the law itself and what it is appropriate to reveal or not to reveal, according to that Act. It is a quite complicated matter, and in other States there has been extensive training on which we can draw in relation to this area, because the matter is sensitive and difficult. In all the Program Estimates, probably all agencies will have a reference to this somewhere, because they will all have to be involved in it. Essentially, we are providing some of the training. If the honourable member wants more details, presumably I can obtain them for him.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What productivity and efficiency gains were achieved arising from the Public Service, Health Commission and teaching service second tier wage increase agreements negotiated in late 1987 and early 1988, and will the Minister say how many Government departments have not yet reached agreement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In late 1987, productivity and efficiency agreements were negotiated as part of the second-tier wage adjustments available under the March 1987 national-State wage case decisions. The agreements relating to the Government Management and Employment Act employees, except correctional officers, Health Commission staff and teachers, involved the use of joint management-employee productivity and efficiency committees to review work practices and make recommendations to the chief executive officers.

Under the terms of the agreements, the efficiency would be implemented no later than July 1989. The Public Service Central Steering Committee, a joint management-union committee, has completed its oversight of the second tier review process. I am pleased to report that, with excellent cooperation from unions and employees, the joint review process was very successful, and 31 out of 34 departmental committees advised the Public Service Central Steering Committee that they had identified savings, productivity improvements and efficiency gains equal to or in excess of the cost of pay increases in their agencies.

In many cases, the review result significantly exceeded the agency costs. The South Australian commission has accepted the results of the reviews. In winding down the process in the commission the President, Mr Justice Stanley,

congratulated the committees on the results achieved and commented on the obvious benefits gained from structural cooperation between management and employees. Responsibility for the implementation of the changes to the management work practices identified by the review process will now rest with management teams.

During last year, the second tier negotiations were finalised for police officers and visiting medical officers. Correctional officers are the only group of Government employees for whom a 4 per cent second tier salary adjustment has not been made. Representatives of the correctional officers have withdrawn from negotiations at this stage, and have only shown an interest in pursuing their claim again in the past month.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Is the department close to reaching agreement with the correctional officers? How long will that process take?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Given the past behaviour of correctional officers, I am not confident about anything.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What policies have been established relating to AIDS in the workplace for public sector employees?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A draft policy has been prepared covering employment issues to ensure that policies and procedures relating to AIDS in the workplace are consistent with existing occupational health and safety and equal opportunity programs. The proposed policy places emphasis on the need for public sector management to ensure the provision of adequate information to all employees; to adhere to relevant occupational health and safety procedures; to ensure that any employee affected by or perceived to be affected by AIDS is protected from discrimination; and to protect the interests of all employees. This draft has been promulgated to chief executive officers of Government agencies, to members of the Government Workers' Safety, Health, Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Coordinating Committee, and to the South Australian Health Commission for comment. In addition, the Crown Solicitor has been asked for advice on particular matters.

Mr LEWIS: Previously the Minister refused to answer a question asked by the member for Light because he said it related to policy, but he answered a question asked by the member for Spence, who referred not to expenditure but to policy. Is there to be consistency?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair certainly strives for consistency. I understand that the Minister refused to answer the question asked by the member for Light because it did not relate to a proposed payment, whereas I presume the Minister accepts that the question asked by the member for Spence related to a proposed payment. To a large extent, the Committee must rely on the Minister to say whether there is a link between the questions and the proposed payments. If there is a link, the Minister should tell us; equally, if there is no link, he should say so. That is the distinction I draw.

Mr LEWIS: I understood that in another instance the Minister refused to give information because he said that it was a policy matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot force the Minister to answer; I can merely rule whether or not the question is relevant and, in some cases, I cannot even do that without the Minister's help. Thus to a certain extent I am in difficulties, but I am reasonably sure that the question asked by the member for Spence was relevant, because it seems to me that a lot of money would be allocated to the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations to ensure, among other things, efficiency, a hygienic working environment

and the well-being of employees generally. That was the basis on which I was prepared to accept the question.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In his opening statement the Minister referred to the ongoing development of and support for Aboriginal employees as the key focus for 1989-90. How much was allocated to initiatives in the Aboriginal employment area, and was that sum spent on those programs? If not, why not?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: One of the highlights of equal opportunity as a Government initiative was the uptake of Aboriginal employment within the Public Service. Aboriginal employment was at about 9.3 per cent of the Public Service. The level of Aboriginal employment in the statutory authorities is much lower, and that will be corrected. Prior to coming to this place I was a member of the National Aboriginal Employment Development Committee and I participated in plans, initiatives and campaigns for private enterprise and Government to take up Aboriginal employment. I am pleased that as a Minister of the Crown I can continue to participate in that work.

The total funding available for Aboriginal employment and career development initiatives was \$708 000; \$498 000 was not spent for the following reasons: funding for programs and establishment of the Aboriginal Employment Unit was estimated on a full financial year basis.

The program involved a significant element of Commonwealth funding and is part of the National Aboriginal Employment Development Program. It was necessary to negotiate and agree with the Commonwealth on specific targets and funding. The agreement with the Commonwealth was not finalised until November 1988. The unit was not formally established until November and did not have a full complement of staff until the beginning of the 1989 year.

The development and implementation of programs was subsequently affected and consequently the rate of expenditure was affected. Despite a low level of expenditure, the total number of recruits to the service, 87, exceeded the agreed target of 59. Due to the above points, program initiatives were late starting, and several programs were deferred into the 1989-90 financial year. Therefore unspent funding from the 1988-89 year has been carried forward into 1989-90 and the budget for 1989-90 is \$1.275 million.

Mr S.J. BAKER: According to the Auditor-General, sick leave is still an issue. I note that that subject features heavily in the comments at the commencement of the Auditor-General's Report. Which departments have still not developed satisfactory management procedures for sick leave, and when will recording and management systems be adequate enough to provide the DPIR with the information that, obviously, was lacking previously and appears still to be lacking?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The application and management of sick leave in departments is not a matter in which the DPIR is involved. The Commissioner of Public Employment will advise of initiatives taken by the Government Management Board in that regard.

Mr Strickland: The member for Mitcham would probably be aware that the Government Management Board, because of concern last year regarding sick leave, commissioned the Australian Bureau of Statistics to undertake a survey of sick leave throughout the South Australian Public Service. That was undertaken on a sample basis; it was not a total census. The major findings were that the level of sick leave on an average basis was about five days for each employee; however, sick leave was considerably higher for some groups at the lower levels of the clerical area. As would be noted from the Program Estimates, the DPIR has been undertaking a

specific project for almost 18 months to redesign clerical work at the CO1 and CO2 levels to take on board these issues. That is our major response to the underlying reasons for the high incidence of sick leave in these areas. In the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations the average sick leave for each employee was six days in the 1988-89 financial year.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a supplementary question, will the Minister provide a copy of that report so that we can actually identify the areas where the ABS surveys indicated the occurrence of higher than average sick leave as between departments and occupations?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The survey was undertaken for the Government Management Board. If the member for Mitcham wanted that information, he should have asked the Premier yesterday. If the question is asked with notice, the relevant information will be provided.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My next question relates to the Equal Opportunity Program. The payment to consultants was \$39 738. Some questions were asked during the previous year about the consultancy relating to a former Premier of this State. What was the total cost of the consultancy, how many days were involved, has it been completed, and will the Minister table the report?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: You are referring to the consultancy in relation to Mr Dunstan?

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is correct.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It involved 53.5 days at a total cost of \$26 750. When the report is available, decisions will be made as to whether or not it will be released.

Mr S.J. BAKER: So, it has been completed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have not said anything.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to the Equal Opportunity Program for Persons with Disability and in one or two other areas there has been a significant decrease in personnel. Have those programs, particularly the disability program, been transferred to the departments concerned, or has equal opportunity become less of an issue amongst those various groups?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In relation to the Aboriginal Equal Opportunity Office, that position has been transferred to the Aboriginal Employment Unit. There has been some trouble in relation to employing an appropriate person for the other position.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a supplementary question, for 1988-89 there has been a decrease of 3.4 for the EEO for Persons with Disability. For 1989-90 that figure is reduced further to .5, so three positions have been lost in that area. What has actually happened? Have we conquered all the problems, or have they been transferred to another department?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that they are training positions which have been transferred.

Mr S.J. BAKER: To where?

Mrs MacIntosh: There has been a transfer and this is one of the adjustments between the subprogram and program level. There has been a reallocation of the resources to the Personnel Management Improvement Program which reflects the mainstreaming of some of the equal opportunity activities. That accounts for two of the FTEs. The additional FTEs are in the vocational training area.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Page 520 of the Program Estimates states that 32 out of 34 departments have sexual harassment policies, including three in draft. Policies have been in place for a number of years, so why is it that two departments still have to address this issue?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will establish the identity of the two departments concerned and advise the honourable member accordingly.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Page 520 also mentions as a 1989-90 specific target/objective that it is proposed to implement the recommendations of the Review of Transport Reimbursement Subsidy Scheme for persons with disabilities. What does that target refer to, and what is involved?

Mr Strickland: That is a Commonwealth program, but we actually implement it at the State level for the Commonwealth. It involves providing a subsidy to those people with disabilities who have difficulty getting to work on public transport. It relates to a subsidy for an Access cab.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Does this relate to people employed in the State Public Service?

Mr Strickland: Yes.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: On that same page, under 1988-89 Specific Targets/Objectives, it states:

Complaints

- Formal EO/EEO complaints lodged with EO Commission from SAPS reduced to 31 from 32 (1987-88).

How was this achieved? Was there a positive program of advice as to what constituted a complaint and what did not?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It illustrates that the Government's equal opportunity program is working extremely well. Our policy is to provide equal opportunity in the departments, and it demonstrates that discrimination is diminishing but we have not entirely eliminated it: people are receiving a fair go.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How many complaints of sexual harassment were made within the Public Service during 1988-89 and how does that compare with 1987-88?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will have to survey the agencies concerned.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My next question relates to staffing of the Public Service, and I refer to page 177 of the Estimates of Payments and to pages 515 and 521 of the Program Estimates. An announcement was made about the recruitment of 300 people for 1989-90 comprising 100 school leavers and 200 ATS trainees. Will the Minister provide the relevant figures for 1988-89 and will these 200 ATS trainees be guaranteed employment?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There were 70 school leavers in the past financial year and we hope to get 100 this financial year. We had 51 trainees in the past financial year, and we hope the number will be 200 in this financial year. The number will be made up by 150 trainees to be placed in clerical and clerical related positions and 50 traineeships to be implemented in non-clerical areas, that is, library assistants, and child-care redevelopment, implemented with the Office of Employment and Training and Technical and Further Education.

Mr S.J. BAKER: My question was whether all the 200, plus the 100, would be guaranteed long-term employment. We were talking about improvement, and some trainees will be going to other areas. For 1988-89 we employed 56.4 and the proposed figure for 1989-90 is 179.2 (page 515 of the Program Estimates), which means that the additional number is 120. My question is in two parts. For how long will the traineeship schemes run and will all people be guaranteed employment?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: School leavers are guaranteed. As to trainees, agreement has been reached with the PSA that departments and the Government will make every effort to employ, but they cannot guarantee that. I ask the Commissioner to elaborate.

Mr Strickland: Because they are trainees, we get some wastage in the year, some drop out or do not shape up. So far, they have been a small number, and those who have completed their traineeships in the past two years have all

found employment within the State public sector. We hope that that continues to be the case.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister provide the latest list of GME Act employees by classification? Last year he provided table 7 from one of the reports produced, I think, by DPIR. Tables 7 and 23 were provided to the Committee when it was dealing with various classifications of GME Act employees, plus the occupation classification distribution for the same group of people. Table 7 covered the period from June 1986 to June 1988 and table 23 covered the end of financial year situation in 1988. Has the Minister tables similar to those that he provided last year?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That information can be provided. If the member wants me to read out the information—

Mr S.J. BAKER: You tabled it last year.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will provide it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister provided some detail on the Aboriginal Training Program. I note a figure of \$987 000 in this year's budget, as well as a carryover from last year. Can the Minister give details of that program? How many participants will there be in the program and what is the nature of the training provided?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Aboriginal people continue to be the most economically and socially disadvantaged group in our community.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Mitcham asked the question. Why should he now laugh?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I asked for details. I accept the Minister's statement about Aborigines being disadvantaged. That is well recognised. I want to know how many Aboriginal people will be participating in the \$1.3 million program in 1989-90. What sort of training will be provided?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Mitcham has asked a fairly complex question, to which one cannot reply in one or two lines. I am trying to answer the question, and he simply smiles and laughs. That is why I asked the question earlier. I will continue.

In 1988-89 the recruitment program resulted in the following achievements. As to clerical administrative staff, this program is particularly designed to attract young Aborigines brought through the school leaver program and through the base grade recruitment activity. The target set for that category was 20, and 34 Aborigines were placed in ongoing positions. Eight of those Aboriginal people were school leavers.

As to graduates, there was a commitment to employ Aboriginal graduates of tertiary institutions, and the target of one for the past year was achieved. As to cadetships, this program aims to increase the number of Aborigines studying in the tertiary sector, and to provide them with departmental support and training. The cadet target was four, and five cadets were placed in departments. As to weekly paid positions, through this program it is hoped to replace longer-term unemployed Aborigines. A target for weekly paid employees was 20, and 24 Aboriginal people were placed. As to apprentices, the apprenticeship program aims to increase the number of skilled Aboriginal tradespeople. The target for 1988-89 was five, and 10 Aborigines were placed in apprenticeship programs.

As to Australian traineeships, this program was particularly aimed at young disadvantaged people and had a target of five Aborigines; and, although 13 Aboriginal young people were placed in traineeship programs, four have withdrawn. Seven Children's Services Office employees participated in the study release programs, and six of those

subsequent vacancies were filled, five with existing Aboriginal employees. In 1988-89 three Aboriginal employees were released on full-time tertiary scholarships, and, while we hope that we have done well with recruitment programs, there is still concern about the rate of retention and promotion of Aboriginal employees. This aspect of the strategy will receive particular attention in 1989-90. The results that we will be seeking include the recruitment of 15 supernumerary school leavers; 15 Australian trainees in the State public sector; two graduates; four cadets; 10 technical trainees; 30 weekly paid employees; and 10 apprentices.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Now you want to know exactly where they will go.

Mr S.J. BAKER: At page 146 of his report the Auditor-General makes some interesting observations about compliance by departments and agencies with the overseas travel rules. Can the Minister inform the Committee about which departments were involved in non-compliance with the rules, and whether any Ministers failed to meet the rules? I am not sure whether Ministers come under that provision, but they may. Will the Minister provide a copy of the written advice to CEOs?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I wish to make something clear: Ministers' overseas travel is not determined by the Overseas Travel Committee. I ask Mr Strickland to respond on the other matters raised by the member for Mitcham.

Mr Strickland: One of my duties is to chair the Overseas Travel Committee. Certainly, the Auditor-General did bring to the committee's attention that in some instances there was a discrepancy between the expenditure approved for a particular trip or for a particular group of people to go overseas (usually it is overseas) and what was actually incurred.

In most instances, it was a fairly small amount and most of it was readily explicable in terms of the fluctuating Australian dollar, changes in local conditions leading to increases in hotel bills and those sorts of things. However, there were two instances where we were a bit concerned because it seemed that the initial budgeting was not particularly good, to say the least and, as a consequence, the committee (under my Chairmanship) has written to each executive officer bringing this matter to their attention, asking them to do certain things about it and providing them with a *pro forma* which might enable them to better control the situation. I shall be happy to provide a copy of that to the Committee.

Mr TYLER: As the member of an extremely young electorate, obviously youth unemployment is a significant issue and concern for me as I know it is for the Minister and the State Government. This State has traditionally had a high youth unemployment problem, but I acknowledge that this Government has made significant inroads into that problem in recent years, and we have seen a fairly major reduction in the high rate of youth unemployment. Nonetheless, as a major employer, what is the State Public Service doing to address this problem?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Youth unemployment and employment has always been a major concern and an area of action for this Government. I know that the member for Mitcham finds this funny and it illustrates his lack of understanding. Prior to the member for Mitcham coming to this place, I had the opportunity of attending one parliamentary Estimates Committee. I watched members of the Opposition in action, and the comments he has just made are totally inaccurate in respect of the prepared questions. When in government, the members of the Liberal Party behaved no differently from the members of the Labor

Party today—they were not different. That illustrates the lack of understanding on his part of what actually happens in this process, and it is an attempt to deny members of the Government their right to solicit information as to how the Government is spending the money. I know that he finds the topic of youth unemployment funny, and that he is very concerned at this Government's success in ensuring that young people are employed.

Since 1983-84, the Public Service has very successfully operated a special youth recruitment program concentrating on high achieving school leavers in the 15 to 19 year old category. The Public Service has had four special intakes of 100 school leavers between 1984 and 1987. For 1988 and 1989, there were in each year special intakes for 70 school leavers and 50 persons employed under the Australian traineeship scheme. The traineeship scheme also focuses on young people in the 15 to 19 year old category. Both programs (the school leavers program and the traineeship program) provide for structured training, both on and off the job.

In addition to increasing the employment opportunities for young people and targeting high achieving school leavers, our special recruitment programs have other aims. One of the reasons for starting a special youth recruitment program was the need to correct an imbalance in the age profile of the Public Service. Some progress has been made in this area but more sustained effort is required. Employment under the Australian traineeship scheme in the Public Service has concentrated on young people from disadvantaged groups, and the program has been successful in attracting a considerable number of Aboriginals and persons who have been unemployed.

Last but not least, one benefit not to be overlooked is the salary saving made through the employment of young people. The average cost difference between the salary of a school leaver aged 18 years and a 21 year old recruit is approximately \$5 000 per annum. As has been stated, South Australia's youth unemployment rate is high. Taking August 1989 as an example, the average youth unemployment rate in Australia was 13.7 per cent (15 to 19 year olds). South Australia's percentage in that area was 15.5 per cent and Tasmania (which has the highest youth unemployment rate) had 18.4 per cent. Given that situation, the Government has developed a comprehensive youth employment strategy which includes the public sector.

I have already announced the employment of 300 young people this year by way of comparison. The special intake of 300 is 2½ times what was done through special recruitment drives in the two previous years. This constitutes a most significant contribution by the South Australian Public Service to increase employment opportunities for young people.

Mr TYLER: I know that those 300 young people will appreciate that and will thank the Minister for that announcement, even if the member for Mitcham does not. Perhaps he has lost a bit of heart since his Leader brutally dumped him from the Shadow Ministry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will ask members of the Committee to cooperate and refrain from their personal comments one on the other, please, or I will abandon the Committee if this standard of behaviour continues.

Mr TYLER: Why does the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations promote work force planning, and have there been any tangible benefits resulting from this process?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Work force planning is essential if the public sector work force of the future is to have the appropriate skills to carry out government programs. The work force is the most important resource available to

Government. The benefits of work force planning will be shared by both management and public sector employees.

For management those benefits include: more informed work force decisions; more effective recruitment programs; and more productive use of human resources. For employees they include: a clearer direction from management on future changes; more information and less anxiety for people directly affected by the change; and more information about opportunities for retraining and career change.

While the principal responsibility for work force planning lies with the chief executive officers of individual agencies, the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations has a role in promoting work force planning in public sector agencies, as well as assisting and advising agencies.

Work force planning in the public sector has had a much higher profile since Cabinet endorsed the report of the Workforce Planning Committee in October 1988. The strategies outlined in the report will lead to a public sector work force which has: improved work force planning; increased mobility and flexibility; improved management practices; less structural rigidities; and increased fairness and equity.

The Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations has achieved the following during the last financial year: widely promoted the Workforce Planning Committee report and its recommendations; and developed a training program to provide public sector personnel with the practical skills needed to improve work force planning. The first workshop was conducted in August 1989. The Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations also has a role in determining and examining work force problems which affect more than one public sector agency and which cannot be handled within the agencies through existing strategies.

During 1988-89, following the identification of an under-supply of financial management skills in the public sector, a joint study was conducted in conjunction with Treasury. As a result of the study, a number of recommendations have been endorsed by Cabinet and are currently being implemented. They address areas such as: improved training and support of non-financial managers; recruitment and development of finance personnel; involvement of financial managers in the planning, policy and decision making processes of agencies; and remuneration of financial managers and a review of the current management accounting structure. These recommendations will assist in ensuring that the public sector has and will have the financial management skills it needs.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

Mr TYLER: What percentage of people with non-English speaking backgrounds work in the Public Service?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The information that was extracted from the 1986 Australian Bureau of Statistics census on population and housing reveals that in June 1986 about 18 per cent of the State Public Service work force was from non-English speaking backgrounds, and that there were similar proportions of males and females. Of the total number of non-English speaking background employees in the State Public Service, 51 spoke a language other than English at home. When compared to all State sector employees, non-English speaking background employees are over-represented in the labour and related workers and tradespersons occupation groups, and under-represented in the managers, administrators, paraprofessionals, personal service, and sales occupation groups. A majority of 54 per cent of non-English speaking background employees in the State Public Service had some qualifications, with the most common qualifications being a degree or higher qualification.

Mr LEWIS: In response to a question before lunch the Minister provided information about the number of Aborigines who will be employed in the Public Service in the next 12 months. The Minister explained that already a number of Aborigines had been employed in various positions in the public sector as a deliberate policy. I want the Committee to understand that in no way do I countenance supporting apartheid policies. How many Aboriginal women are now employed in the public sector, given that we are talking about equal opportunities not only for people from minority cultural backgrounds but also for those who, in the past, it is believed were unfairly treated on the basis of their sex? Are any disabled women or men amongst that group? What is the policy in relation to those groups for next year? In what categories of employment is it proposed they will be employed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Is the member for Murray-Mallee asking about Aborigines only?

Mr LEWIS: Yes.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The department aims to employ 1 per cent of Aborigines in the public sector, which is about their representation in the South Australian population. The exact numbers of Aborigines who work under the GME Act are 94 females and 74 males; those who do not work under the GME Act are 68 females and 25 males; weekly-paid employees are 111 females and 95 males; in other capacities it is three females and 20 males; and that totals 276 females and 214 males. We do not know whether or not any of those people are disabled.

Mr LEWIS: What jobs are envisaged under the training program, about which the Minister spoke before lunch? What trades is it proposed in which to provide apprenticeships? How many males and females does the Minister expect to be included in those categories?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As I said earlier, we want to recruit 15 school leavers, 15 under the Australian trainee scheme, two graduates, four cadets, 10 technical trainees, 30 weekly-paid employees, and 10 apprentices. Which trades, groups, or callings these Aborigines go into depends on which Aborigines we can attract.

Mr LEWIS: They are goals in terms of figures, not in terms of occupations.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We want to get those numbers if we can. Last financial year we had goals relating to Aboriginal employment and, in most cases, we exceeded those goals. If we were able to attract more than 10 apprentices who were suitable and wanted to work, I think that we would find positions for them. It is very important that, for this group of people in our community who are under-represented in employment, we establish a concept of regular full-time employment to get them out of the poverty trap. The State public sector is doing its bit. I assure the honourable member that it is a thankless task to try to convince employers of this, but I think it is starting to work.

Mr LEWIS: Can the Minister reassure me and the Committee that the real reason for this policy is not only because some people have black skins and that the people who will be employed in these positions are not given them because they have black skins, but are coming from a group of people who coincidentally have black skins and who happen to be socio-economically disadvantaged at this time and under-represented in the work force? So, if an applicant of Aboriginal extraction was perceived to be well off and had parents who already enjoyed good and continuous employment, they would not be given a job just because of their Aboriginal extraction; but that those Aborigines who will be given a job and who will be sought and included in this

program will come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Is that the way the department administers its policies?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of Aboriginal employment, the department will be trying to attract into employment people who claim they are Aborigines. That is the first criteria. Unlike other countries, Australia has never licensed or registered people of Aboriginal descent; it is whether or not they recognise they are Aborigines. The schemes we will be offering are designed to attract those who are now unemployed. Ruby Hammond, when she was working in the Aboriginal Employment Unit, had the task to get one of the Aborigines who congregated in Victoria Square to accept full-time employment under this scheme. She was of the view that if one Aborigine accepted a number of others would accept from that group. It is a long, slow process of encouraging disadvantaged people to accept employment. If one is used to a certain lifestyle, as much as I and a number of people here today would find difficult to accept, one can adjust and live in a satisfactory manner. We need to break that and get these Aborigines out of the poverty trap, and full-time employment will generate that.

A by-product of this is that it establishes people in full-time employment who other Aborigines can look up to. That is why this program is so successful. Ruby was successful in making inroads into this group. I trust that those who follow her will have similar success, because it is very important.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I understand that the Government has a scheme that provides financial assistance for Public Service employees to retire early. How does this scheme work? How many people have participated in it? How successful has it been?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The scheme is not about numbers. It assists in the management of redeployed people, that is, employees declared excess to requirement in Government agencies. Offers to participate in the scheme can only be made by management in positions excess to requirement where redeployment and retraining are not viable options. The scheme is available for permanently employed excess employees aged 55 years and over. It provides a reduced relative benefit for increased age, years of service over 25 years and salaries over \$18 000 per annum. The reason for the reduction is that, as employees get nearer to retirement age, the potential loss of earnings decreases.

In the financial year 1988-89, a total of 160 offers were made to employees in the Public Service and statutory authorities. There were 127 acceptances with a total payout of \$3.36 million in incentive payments. In most cases salary savings from abolition of the position involved were sufficient to cover the cost within 12 months. Each offer is premised on the understanding that long-term savings will be realised.

A review of the scheme in 1989 concluded that it was a valuable tool in managing the redeployment process. Some minor changes have been recommended to make it more attractive to lower salary earners, but these will not affect the viability of the scheme.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister will no doubt have noted the remarks of the Auditor-General about the Austpay system. It is worthwhile repeating the remarks contained within the report as follows:

In seeking those views, I pointed out that it was Audit's view that development (including the acquisition of hardware and software) is being driven, in many cases, by computer oriented rather than management oriented people, and from the middle management level; and that it once again brings into focus the need for senior management to become better informed and satisfied (in a non-technical way) about the need and the benefits to be gained from data processing developments in their agency. I also stressed the need for greater emphasis to be given to

attracting to the data processing area people with management skills and practical 'field' experience, particularly in management accounting and business systems.

The Auditor-General made a number of observations about Austpay, and I note that page 521 of the Program Estimates states:

Implement upgraded Austpay software into agencies.

Will the Minister assure us that this system, whose origins date back to the 1970s, will actually work properly and will be implemented in such a way as to assist the process? I note that six positions have been made available this year for that process.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Common pay was a system used by 26 agencies to pay 14 200 employees each fortnight, and that system is being replaced progressively by Austpay. It was required by the State Services Department to replace the common pay system. It is now used by 32 agencies to pay 18 000 employees per fortnight. The revenue earned by State Computing from Austpay is 41 per cent above estimates. It has contributed to a net gain against estimates of \$392 000 over five years. The other developments associated with Austpay that have provided benefits to agencies are: the Human Resource Allocation System (which has an acronym of HRAS, which is a bit unfortunate); it assists agencies report on salary costs and employee full-time equivalents against Program Estimates, it provides savings in agencies in work related to administering payroll tax, the on-costs associated with State superannuation and the public sector employee superannuation scheme. I refer also to sick leave reporting, which assists agency managers to monitor the incidence of sick leave. Other features of Austpay will only be developed if they can be supported by a sound business case. It is my advice that each month more Government departments are transferring to Austpay and leaving the common pay system.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That really did not answer the question that I asked. Given the pointed comments in the Auditor-General's Report, can we have some assurances that difficulties will be fixed up? I noted that the board report of October 1988 confirmed the earlier audit concerns. In particular, the report identified:

... difficulty in determining an accurate total cost of acquiring, developing and implementing the Austpay system in the 30 agencies at that time. From the fragmented information available, the report put the cost at about \$2.5 million.

It talks about the expectations of the system that do not seem able to be met. The question related to some ministerial assurances that this system will actually work in the way in which it is designed to work. The price has been considerable.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I know that the member for Mitcham can be a bit obtuse at times. For the benefit of the honourable member, sick leave reporting that assists agency managers monitoring sick leave is the first of its type in the world, and it is on this Austpay system. The fact that people are jumping from common pay into Austpay indicates that the system is worthwhile. It was able to earn greater revenue than anticipated. The Auditor-General has made some comments there, and, from the advice I have had from the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations, some of the problems indicated will be overcome, and Austpay has demonstrated its viability into the future.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The personnel management part of the system is not being used, and we are paying big dollars for the software system.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It has only just been developed. I made the point that, if a business case can be supported for the development and introduction of those additional things into Austpay, it will happen. We anticipate that that

will happen progressively. At the moment, we are moving to have Austpay replace the common pay system, and it is just doing that.

In this business we will walk and then run: we will not run and walk at the same time. In this way, we will overcome some of the implementation difficulties that arise when we introduce new systems. It is being done progressively, and the reports I have indicate that it is happening rather quickly.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note the Minister's earlier comments that a lot of water is still to flow under the bridge in terms of what the commission expects from the public sector and what will be regarded as compliance. What discussions have been held, and has any agreement been reached about the approach to be adopted in the pursuit of the flow-on benefits of the national wage decision to the public sector in South Australia?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Extensive discussion has taken place with unions, and with members employed by the State Public Service. To date, no specific agreement has been reached with any of the unions. Only after the handing down of the decision by the State Industrial Commission in respect of the national wage case and the guidelines arising from that will we be able to do anything.

After that, I anticipate that some approaches will be made, because some arrangements are fairly close to fruition. Until we know exactly what the guidelines from the State commission are, we cannot reach agreement, although people understand where they are at certain levels. The degree of progress is all over the place. Some unions have progressed further in these discussions than others.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that there has been an increase of more than 100 per cent over the budgeted amount last year for administrative expenses under 'Industrial and Employee Relations:' \$104 300 has been allocated this year. What is the reason for that increase?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It was caused principally by changes to subprograms. In my opening remarks I referred to rearrangement of programs and subprograms and to extensive changes. The reallocation of resources involves \$130 000 for employee appeals from interagency support services programs and 2.9 full time effective employees; and additional funding from arbitration expenses related to the cost of travelling interstate to attend Federal wage cases. That involves interagency changeover.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I believe all members would agree that one of the most common approaches to members in their electorate offices relates to entry to the Public Service. I note that a review of the base grade clerical selection test is proposed. What does that test involve at present and how will it be reviewed?

Mr Strickland: Basically, the test covers numeracy and literacy; it is a test on arithmetic, the understanding of written material, the ability to precis and verbal and written expression. Over the years people have claimed that the test reflects the mainstream of society, hinting that it discriminates against people from non-English speaking backgrounds or disadvantaged backgrounds.

Reviews have been undertaken in respect of those matters in the past, and we have tried to ensure that the test is fair and does not discriminate against such people. We will do that again this year; that is our primary aim.

Another general reason for the review is to ensure that the test is up to date and relevant. It gives us a fairly good handle. I should stress that the test is not the only measure we use. We do not stipulate, as did the mandarins of ancient China, that, if people pass the test, they may get into the

Public Service. We also conduct interviews and carry out a series of assessments, but the test is an important element.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It is reassuring that that test covers a range of activities and that a further review along those lines is proposed. I note under 'Industrial and Employee Relations'—issues/trends (page 522 of the Program Estimates) that it is proposed to eliminate impediments to multi-skilling. I am aware that that is quite a problem in the private sector, but that problem could arise in various trades and sub-professions, particularly given the skills required for the submarine project and the frigate program. What is proposed in the Government sector to handle this problem?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is part of an award restructuring decision that was handed down by the Industrial Relations Commission. Parts of that decision apply to the State Industrial Commission rather than the Commonwealth Industrial Relations Commission. The Deputy President approved award variations to the building, metal trades, transport and clerical areas. The concept requires restructuring of working processes. In the metal industry in particular 365 classifications have been reduced to 14 classifications. It will mean that some of the demarcation disputes that I would have found acceptable when I was a tradesman or serving my apprenticeship are no longer acceptable; in other words, the demarcation lines are being redrawn. For example, a tradesman with general metal working skills would acquire many more metal working skills. The decision of the Industrial Relations Commission took into account our ongoing process of structural change. It will also mean that people who commence work in these areas do not remain at a certain level of skill, with impediments being placed before them so that they are forced to stay where they are without advancing in the industry.

For instance, Government clerical workers, females in particular, find that restrictions are placed before them so that they cannot move out of a narrow band. We are endeavouring to ensure that a general clerical worker is able to undertake a wide range of tasks and that the department provides for their undertaking additional education so that they can progress up the ladder and gain promotion within the department. It is quite possible that the old saying that 'every soldier has a field marshal's baton in his knapsack', will be replaced by the addage that 'every clerical officer has the executive officer's car keys in their purse'.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note from page 515 of the Program Estimates last year just over \$1 million was spent for Public Service recruitment; this year \$3.643 million is proposed. In addition, the number of average full time equivalents has increased from 56.4 to 179.2. I support that expansion, because it is aimed at recruiting from the unemployed ranks and other areas. Can the Minister assure the Committee that the department will be able to cope with that large expansion and still function efficiently, as it has done in the past? I would be the first to say that I have nothing but a high regard for the DPIR and the way in which it has operated in the past.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The department recruits these people and the allocation is made under these lines, but those people will be placed with other departments. This allocation involves principally the recruitment of young people.

Mr S.J. BAKER: For what was the consultancy payment of \$12 375 for interagency support? What is intended for 1989-90?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Do you want to know the amount in relation to consultancy payments?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, I am asking about the figure of \$12 375. How was that \$12 000 expended, and what is planned for 1989-90?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: This year a Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations computing study cost \$23 625. A joint Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations and Department of Labour computer project cost \$4 750. My advice is that an allowance is made to meet consultancies as they arise on an *ad hoc* basis.

Mr S.J. BAKER: So, no project is planned at this stage?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that this year the department will spend \$1.3 million on computing equipment. Although we have diabolical problems with computers, the Premier said that it is no different from any other public sector. Given the problems involved with the Justice Information System hardware and the fact that some criticisms have been made about under utilisation after computer boffins have ordered equipment which has no relationship to management needs, will the Minister give an assurance that the computing equipment that has been purchased by the department has been vetted by the Government Management Board and that the system is the most effective available?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The answer to all questions is 'Yes'. The Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations and the Department of Labour are both considering securing a mini computer so that, particularly the Department of Labour, can obtain its programs from the Justice Information System and also so that the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations can utilise the Justice Information System. It is anticipated that a joint computer facility between the two departments will save \$900 000 over a five year period. The Directors of both departments have been involved in the steering committee as have officers from both departments.

The proposal has been considered by the Government Management Board and another committee that looks at computer purchases. Tomorrow the Directors of the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations and the Department of Labour will select a manager who will manage the procurement, the installation and operation of this computer.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What data will be stored on this system?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The data will include all South Australian Industrial Commission awards, registration places for dangerous substances, and registration of industrial places in relation to Government workers compensation. It will include also details about recruitment for the whole Public Service. It will contain data relating to various things and it will also have a word processing capability.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the votes completed.

Labour, \$25 015 000

Chairman

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members

The Hon. R.K. Abbott

Mr S.J. Baker

Mr G.A. Ingerson

Mr I.P. Lewis

The Hon. R.G. Payne

Mr P.B. Tyler

Witness

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Labour.

Departmental Advisers

Mr H. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.

Mr A. Dangerfield, Assistant Director, Industrial Affairs.

Mr G. Billett, Manager, Administration and Finance Branch.

Mr P. Ochota, Assistant Director, Regional and Technical Services.

Mr C. Meikle, Chief Executive Officer, Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

Ms J. Powning, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Occupational Health and Safety Commission.

Ms S. Callinan, Acting Women's Adviser.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Does the Minister intend to make an opening statement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes. As I advised this committee last year, 1988-89 again saw the continued successful operation of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. This legislation operating in conjunction with the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 has resulted in significant improvements in the rights and conditions for all employees and employers in South Australia.

Occupational health and safety inspections now cover all workplaces and as such require a broad range of expertise. In this regard the department recruited 12 inspectors in 1988-89 with a wide variety of backgrounds following a successful call outside the service. The department's 32 Occupational Health and Safety Inspectors play a leading role in this area and have established an effective liaison with all parties involved. The Act provides for several tools which inspectors use to reduce the number of dangerous situations, including verbal instructions, written improvement notices and prohibition notices, and prosecutions for breaches.

Increasing use is being made of improvement notices, which are considered to be effective, because they are posted on notice boards for workers and management to see.

The deterrent value of prosecutions is increasing, with heavy fines recently being imposed on companies which breached the Act, which reinforces the importance placed on occupational health and safety by this Government. The maximum fine imposed so far as \$10 000 and strenuous efforts are being made to increase these to further increase their deterrent and educational value.

Demands on all areas of Government during 1988-89 have never been greater and this trend is expected to continue in 1989-90. As well as the occupational health and safety area, the demands on the department's investigation officers have increased dramatically. This is mainly as a result of the significant and complex changes that have occurred in the wage fixation system, together with employees being much more aware of their rights. The Industrial Advisory Service alone handled 80 000 telephone calls on wages and award conditions in 1988-89 with a further 120 000 being handled by regional offices across the State. It is pleasing to report that of the 1 425 complaints alleging breaches of awards and industrial legislation during 1988-89, 96 per cent were resolved by negotiation. It is a credit to the telephone and field staff that the workload was effectively handled. To more accurately reflect the current situation the apportionment of time worked by regional services staff who are involved in several program areas has been reassessed. The revised figures are included in the

expenditure and staffing details for 1989-90 as shown in the Program Estimates.

The 1989-90 budget includes \$12.161 million for the administration of the Government Workers Safety, Health, Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Program. It also contains \$11 million for the three areas of injury prevention and risk management (\$2 million), the WorkCover Exempt Employer Levy (\$2 million), and settlement payments for claims under the previous Workers Compensation Act 1971 (\$7 million). Previously these payments were only shown in the Program Estimates papers but have now been included in the Estimates of Payments to more accurately reflect the costs involved. Continuing emphasis will be placed on prevention in 1989-90. This follows on from the very successful Alan Bruce Risk Management Program which was first implemented in Government departments in 1987-88.

This is the first time that the department's budget includes a central line for claim payments arising under the old Workers Compensation Act. This has been done because old Act claims, relating as they do to incidents occurring prior to September 1987, are matters for which current line managers cannot continue to be held accountable in any meaningful way, since they have only limited ability to influence the settlement of these claims which are handled by the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Office in conjunction with the Crown Solicitors Office. This change is consistent with the aim of making line managers throughout the Public Service properly and meaningfully accountable for those incidents that are within their ability to control.

The 1989-90 budget also reflects a significant change in the funding of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. To further highlight the commission's independence from the department their budget has been shown separately under a miscellaneous line. Other significant developments included in the 1989-90 budget are as follows.

The provision of \$365 000 towards the establishment of the South Australian Workplace Resource Centre in conjunction with the Commonwealth. This major initiative is a clear demonstration of the Government's commitment to the award restructuring process. Staff of the centre will be available to act as consultants to employers, industry groups and trade unions to assist in the difficult process of structural efficiency in order to ensure the continued viability and competitiveness of our local industry. It is anticipated that, with the support of local commerce and industry, the centre will become self-funding within a year or two.

The provision of \$66 000 for the establishment of a migrant workers centre at Trades Hall. This was a major recommendation of the Immigrant Workers Task Force Report and has been funded as a social justice initiative. This should also be seen as a major initiative of this Government demonstrating its continuing commitment to the migrant community. There is ample research providing conclusive evidence that immigrant workers do not have equitable access to information and services which in turn reduces their ability to exercise their industrial rights. The purpose of the centre, under the auspices of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia will be to improve access to industrial rights through the provision of multi-lingual information and services.

The continuation of a further \$85 000 grant to the United Trades and Labor Council to coordinate the training of job representatives in occupational health and safety.

The provision of \$30 000 for the continuation of the outworkers project. This is also a priority social justice initiative in the department.

Two staff (\$90 000) for the continuation of computer developments including those currently on the Justice Information System. In this regard, the Department of Labour will be involved in a joint venture with the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations.

Following regulations of class 6 (poisonous) and class 8 (corrosive) substances, there is continuing pressure to regulate all dangerous substances. During 1989-90 steps will be taken to regulate Class 5 (oxidising) substances, such as swimming pool chemicals.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Mitcham intend to make an opening statement?

Mr S.J. BAKER: No. With the indulgence of the Committee, the Opposition is asking a set of standard questions of each portfolio. As to sick leave, as he did last year can the Minister provide information on the amount of sick leave taken, detailing the amounts, the occurrences on Monday or Friday and after holiday weekends? The next question relates to CEOs in each of the Minister's departments. Will the Minister provide information on the current salary of the CEO and the salary applying at 30 June 1988 and 30 June 1989, and any allowance that the CEO receives in addition to salary? My third general question is how many officers are currently employed at EO and AO levels? Fourthly, can the Minister provide a break-down of the inter-agency support services into salaries and wages and related payments, administrative expenses, minor equipment and sundries?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If the member for Mitcham wanted the information about DPIP, he should have asked me when we were dealing with it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am sure that the Minister will accommodate me in this regard.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In respect of sick leave in the Department of Labour, in line with recent directions by DPIP the level of sick leave is also monitored, and 1988-89 saw a decrease to 5.8 days, an overall average of sick leave taken per employee. There is also a significant reduction in the number of single-day absences, including those on a Monday and Friday. For comparison, in 1987-88 it was 1 583 days; in 1988-89 it was 1 482. The average for 1987-88 was 6.6 and for 1988-89 it is 5.8. The total number of sick single days was 613 in 1987-88 and 508 in 1988-89. For single days on Monday or Friday it was 277 in 1987-88 and 224 days in 1988-89. We will provide information about the salary, but I would have thought that announcements were made earlier this year about the salary paid to CEOs as determined by the Remuneration Tribunal.

So that the member does not ask every Minister, I will provide him with the Remuneration Tribunal's report, which was well publicised in the press at the time. The allowances were absorbed into the salary and I am advised by the Chief Executive Officer that no others are paid to him. We have three executive officers. I will supply the Committee with the number of administrative officers. How detailed does the member want it?

Mr S.J. BAKER: There is just one line in the Budget Estimates. It is not broken down into the components.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Does the member want salaries, payroll tax and worker's compensation details?

Mr S.J. BAKER: If they are the components of the block item which we have for the inter-agency support services, yes.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will see what we can do.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I will start with the most important, compelling point. The Minister is well aware of, and he has already made some comments about, the national wage determination, and he would have noted the determination

by the commission in relation to the raising of minimum awards and the \$20 to \$30 pay increase that is to be paid in two stages, consequent upon award restructuring. Is the Minister aware that South Australia enjoys a lower level of overaward payments and that that is one of the reasons why the commission wishes to simplify the system and lift minimum payments? Will he be making a submission to the commission to recognise this difference in South Australia, and will the Government be requesting a longer period for phasing in minimum award increases for which the commission has allowed in its judgment?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The answer to both questions is 'No'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As a point of clarification, the Government's response will be for a full flow-on of the minimum award arrangements to be implemented as soon as possible. Will that be the Government's submission to the commission?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As I said in examination of an earlier budget line at which both of us were present, when the Industrial Commission of South Australia hands down its decision—if past decisions are any guide—it will hand down a decision very similar to that which was handed down by the Industrial Relations Commission recently. The only variation that one can anticipate will involve some matters that are peculiar to South Australia only. They are matters of fact, not matters peculiar to the operation of the commission in South Australia.

In respect of the other matters, I imagine that they will be argued award by award, as they are currently being argued in the Industrial Relations Commission in the major award areas. We are all aware that the metal industry matter has been or will be concluded today; the building industry matter has been finalised; and it is quite possible that matters relating to transport, clerical and several other major areas will also be finalised. Then we will see a major acceptance by the ACTU of the system and expect to see the other State commissions adopting those guidelines.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is recognised, and it is statistically shown, that the level of overaward payments in South Australia is significantly less than the national average and, in particular, less than that in New South Wales and Victoria. Given that the minimum wage determination by the Industrial Relations Commission actually gave this as one of the reasons for the upwards movement of the minimum wage, will the Minister be asking the commission to recognise the difference between the South Australian situation and the national situation upon which the commission has ruled?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No. I thought I made it fairly clear a little earlier. For the benefit of the member for Mitcham (because he needs to understand this), the commission lays down general guidelines. It will not lay down specific dollar and cent amounts for each one of these awards, because they involve structural readjustment of working practices within that award area. It will be done award by award. The honourable member is asking the Government to have somebody present at every hearing or negotiation, whether or not it is a party to that award. That is just plain nonsense. I can now understand why the member is no longer the industrial affairs spokesman. He has no industrial understanding.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In other words, the Government will not be making any submission to the commission: it will only be making a submission to the commission in the case of State employees? Is that what the Minister is saying? If we adhere to the Minister's argument that it will be done award by award, the State Government will have no say

whatsoever in the conduct of the commission in the flow-on of the national wage decision. Is that what he is saying?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I don't know what you are saying.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, you've just said—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call both members to order and ask each to speak through the Chair.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I think I have made myself fairly clear on what we intend to do.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: On page 504 of the Program Estimates, under 'Industry/Occupational Licensing and/or Regulation', one of the 1989-90 specific targets and objectives is, 'To review provisions of the Shop Trading Hours Act to reflect current retailing trends and consumer demands'. The most recent attempt to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act was defeated in Parliament in April 1988, but community debate continues unabated. What are the Government's proposals in this area as outlined in this program?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Our Government has made its position quite clear with respect to shop trading hours. Our view is that there ought to be Saturday afternoon shopping in South Australia. Had the Liberal Opposition not been obtuse and given a commitment that it later found to be wrong, we would have it now and would not need exemptions. At present, the only shops that cannot legally open on Saturday afternoons are the large departmental stores and food shops. Indeed, if they wanted to, most of the small retailers in Rundle Mall could open on a Sunday and even Saturday afternoons. We are placed in a ridiculous situation where very few traders cannot, and indeed are not allowed to, trade. On our return to Government we intend to put a proposal to the Parliament that there be an extension to the trading hours. We are considering an extension for the Grand Prix weekend, in the weekends leading up to Christmas and during the Festival of Arts in March 1990.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Referring to the same program on the same page, what progress has been made in the development of legislation to amend the Employees Registry Offices Act?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The provisions of the Employees Registry Offices Act were reviewed so as to reflect current trends and to take account of the provisions of International Labour Office Convention 96. The following matters are proposed for discussion with interested parties: agency fee structures—flat fee versus percentage of wage offered; charging of fees to both parties (employer and employee); and certificates of justice and ratepayers.

Other matters include the introduction of modern terminology and the removal of gender based language. Discussion with interested parties is to ensure that the amendments will not only reflect current industry trends and practice (both within and outside the State) but also will protect agency clients from exploitation by unscrupulous operators.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Is the workload of the Industrial Commission likely to increase as a result of the August 1989 national wage case?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes. If the restructuring proposed by the Industrial Relations Commission decision goes ahead and the work to which I am privy comes to fruition, I think the Industrial Commission will have an extremely heavy workload. It will be in our interests to ensure that that heavy workload does not hold up the settlement of awards and agreements.

Mr INGERSON: Does the Minister have a car phone or cellular phone that is rented and paid for at taxpayers' expense? If so, when was it installed? What was the cost of acquisition and installation and the operating costs in the last financial year and for this financial year to date? Will

the Minister give a breakdown of costs to indicate local STD and ISD calls?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There is one cellular phone, but I have no idea of its cost.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister supply that information to the Committee?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will see what we can do.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to Program I on page 173 of the Estimates of Payments. Why are additional resources being provided for industry and occupational licensing and regulations in 1989-90? Has there been an increase in non-compliance?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that the number of personnel has stayed the same but that there has been an adjustment in officers' salaries between programs.

Mr INGERSON: On page 511 of the Program Estimates I note that unfair dismissals increased from 421 in 1985 to 724 in 1988. What are the figures for 1988-89? What is the delay in obtaining those figures? Will the Minister agree that the system is becoming unworkable, and will he consider changing it?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The figures for 1988-89 will be supplied when the Industrial Court provides us with them. I do not think that the matter is unworkable: many people now have access to the Industrial Court to rectify what they see are unfair dismissals.

Mr INGERSON: On a supplementary question, the Program Estimates state that this trend requires investigation and analysis. Does the Minister intend carrying out that investigation and analysis?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that the department is waiting for a Victorian report into the matter, and it will then look at what needs to be done.

Mr INGERSON: How does a Victorian report relate to unfair dismissals in South Australia?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The reinstatement provisions in Victoria are similar to those in South Australia. A report is being prepared for the Victorian Government, and it seems sensible for us to delay doing anything until that report is available. Then, we will know its contents and, when it is available, we will look at our situation. It means that costs, duplication and other matters will make the report in this State easier to prepare. If we prepare it in the same way we can draw comparisons between the States to see how our legislation works compared with the Victorian legislation. I should have thought that that would make obvious sense.

Mr TYLER: I refer to page 505 of the Program Estimates. How many appeals were heard by the Workers Compensation Appeals Tribunal in 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Appeals lodged during that time number 61, of which 57 were appeals against the decision to review office and four were against the decision of a medical review panel. Of the 61 appeals lodged, 12 were allowed, seven were dismissed, 11 were discontinued, 12 were adjourned, 12 were scheduled for hearing and seven had been heard and were awaiting decisions.

Mr TYLER: I refer again to page 505. How many judges, commissioners and industrial magistrates are currently members of the Industrial Court and Commission?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: There are currently seven judges, including two temporary judges from the District Court, four commissioners and two industrial magistrates. With a progressive downturn in workers compensation cases under the old Act, it is anticipated that the number of deputy presidents in the Industrial Court and Commission will gradually decrease over time. The present intention is that two of the seven judges will be transferred to the District Court early in 1990.

Mr TYLER: I again refer to the same page. It is claimed that substantial cost savings have been made in the production of industrial gazettes. How much has been saved, and why was it saved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: About \$140 000 was saved in the production of South Australian industrial gazettes compared with the previous year, and it is estimated that a further \$60 000 will be saved this financial year. The reason has been the change in the method of production. Previously, each gazette was prepared on a cut and paste basis with the copy going backwards and forwards between the Government Printer and the Industrial Registrar. The gazette is now virtually set up completely from awards databased on the justice information system and is transferred once only direct to the Government Printer in a final form for printing.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Last year the Minister provided the Committee with a breakdown of the assets of the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Fund. Will he do the same this year?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Of \$16.074 million worth of investments, \$3.758 million relates to Treasury and \$250 000 are deposits on the purchase of property. That totals some \$20.082 million. I do not propose to say who has those investments, but they are in normal bank bills and things like that.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister provided a breakdown of the \$16 million last year.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: They are securities and bank bills. We can do that, I suppose.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How will the Government deal with the surpluses in that fund? I make two observations: first, a number of payments have been made to the fund under rather questionable circumstances. The Minister will recognise that when certain people with only a passing acquaintance with the building industry walk onto building sites they have been required to put in a return. If they do not do so they cannot work on the job; I will not comment about that practice.

Secondly, many people in the industry will not claim because they will not stay in the industry for more than a few years. The fund was set up to cover those people who would stay in the industry but not necessarily with the same employer for a period of more than seven years. So, if those observations are correct, there will be a considerable surplus in that fund. How will the Minister deal with that? People have observed that the sum in the fund has increased significantly over the past four years.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The first thing is that if one is covered by the Act, one must pay—there is no escaping that. In respect of huge surpluses, I have seen a report prepared by the actuary (which has yet to be presented to Parliament) which will state, in essence, that while, at the time of finalising that report in June 1988 the fund was slightly in surplus, the managers of the fund would have to watch the fund carefully to ensure that it did not slip into deficit. It even hinted that in a short period of time there might have to be some increases in the percentage contribution by the employers. That is a matter for the board to consider now that it has received the actuary's report.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Program 4 deals with occupational health and safety. Earlier this year, the Minister announced that he was not satisfied, because the number of deaths related to industrial accidents had actually increased. Will the Minister provide statistics showing the number of people who have died as a result of industrial accidents or disease for the first six months of 1989 in comparison with

the first six months of 1988, and will he provide some detail as to why the increase took place? Is the legislation failing?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No, I do not think that the legislation is failing. I have a list of people who died in the 1988-89 year. We do not have the full details, but I know that the figure is significantly higher for the first half of the year. During the 1988 calendar year, 20 people were killed at work, most of the deaths occurring in the latter half of the year. There has been a high incidence of deaths at work this year, and in the first six months there were approximately five. One or two of those may come off the list, as I am not sure of the way the workers died. I will provide the dates to the honourable member.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: On page 504 of the Program Estimates the statement is made that during 1988 the Motor Fuel Licensing Board conducted 17 public hearings and 21 investigations were conducted by inspectors. It is that latter part that interests me: will the Minister give some information as to the scope of the investigations, what is involved and how they are carried out?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: What actually happens is that the inspectors visit the area seeking the licence and check it out to see whether the premises are exactly as the licence application says.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note that it is proposed under the 1989-90 Specific Targets/Objectives to review the provisions of the Motor Fuel Licensing Act. What changes to the provisions are believed necessary?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The major change being considered at the moment is the difference between permits and licences. There is a slight difference, and an investigation into both is being carried out. One point of view is that when someone has a permit there is no need to go through the full application to have that converted to a licence, or *vice versa*.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In relation to the Estimates of Payments, program 2, the cost of the reporting service voted last year was \$696 000 with the actual being \$588 130; \$696 000 is proposed for the financial year under consideration. That is a fairly reasonable sort of jump. I thought that the reporting service cost had been put into tune somewhat over the past 12 to 18 months, and I would not have expected to see a large increase of that nature, unless there is some special proposal.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: One of the problems with the Industrial Commission relates to the length of hearings. A case set down in the courts for three days can perhaps collapse after half a day, and some cases go on for two or three days. It is a very unpredictable business, and that is why close attention was able to keep the cost down. However, it is prudent to budget for a cost similar to that of the previous financial year.

Mr INGERSON: Some significant parts of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act have been removed from State authority. What are the implications for the State jurisdiction? How many other Federal areas are likely to be affected, and does this mean that there could be some significant duplication of resources?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It means that there is no duplication of resources, because the Commonwealth people do not have inspectors on the trains to do the inspections. The State Government, in concert with the Commonwealth and other State Governments, attempted earlier this year to have the occupational health and safety provisions of the Vehicle Industry Award removed. They were unsuccessful in that effort and that has meant that employees in South Australia employed at Holden's and Mitsubishi are not covered by the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act.

There are some limitations to that. As far as that Act applies to public safety, apparently the State jurisdiction applies. Serious negotiation has taken place between the department, the unions and the two principal employers for departmental officers to carry out inspections and make recommendations. It is not a very satisfactory procedure, but it is the only procedure under which we can see that the employees of both these factories will receive appropriate occupational health, safety and welfare coverage.

Mr INGERSON: When will the Occupational Health and Safety Commission report to Parliament?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The report is due in December.

Mr INGERSON: What is the size of the industrial inspectorate doing the normal rounds of inspection of premises and following up advices of unsafe practices, injuries, etc.?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The figures are as follows: Adelaide and Adelaide east, one regional manager, two boiler inspectors, six factory inspectors, three construction safety inspectors and six investigation officers, including an assistant investigation officer; southern, one regional manager, 1.8 boiler inspectors, 5 factory inspectors, two construction safety inspectors and four investigation officers; northern, one manager, one boiler inspector, four factory inspectors, one construction safety inspector, one shearing accommodation officer and three investigation inspectors; Port Adelaide, one manager, two boiler inspectors, six factory inspectors, one construction safety inspector, and three investigation officers; Berri, one manager and one investigation officer; Mount Gambier, one manager, one boiler inspector, one factory inspector, one construction safety inspector and one construction safety officer; Port Pirie, one regional manager, one factory inspector and one investigation officer; Whyalla, one manager, one boiler inspector, one factory inspector and one investigation officer. The total is eight regional managers, 8.8 boiler inspectors, 24 factory inspectors, eight construction safety inspectors, 20 investigation officers and one shearing accommodation inspector.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note (page 500 of the Program Estimates) that last year 25.4 average full-time equivalents were proposed under 'Safety on construction and demolition sites' and 21.1 were actually employed; this year this number will be reduced to 15.6 FTEs. That reduction may be tied to the establishment of the workplace safety committee, which would eliminate the need for as much external inspection as was carried out previously—provided the committees are in place and working.

Mr Bachmann: There has been a reapportionment between subprograms within programs and salaries. The number of people engaged in that work has not altered, but the cost is reflected more accurately within the subprogram under that program.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note that there is an increase of about 2.5 FTEs under 'Safety of all other workplaces not elsewhere covered'. Would that account for that reduction?

Mr Bachmann: That is so. We are still feeling our way regarding the additional number of workplaces that have to be inspected. The number has increased, and thus more resources have been allocated; the costs reflect those resources.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note that it is proposed to increase the allocation for program 3 'Conditions of employment—accommodation and service costs' (page 173 of the Estimates of Payments) from \$74 538, which was actually spent, to \$113 000. That is a significant increase, and I take it that it is not just a matter of the adjustment of salaries. As they may still say in Yorkshire, a bum takes up the same space whether or not it is sitting down.

Mr Bachmann: It is along those lines. We receive a block bill from the Department of Housing and Construction for rental costs, and this year we have attempted to apportion that rental charge more accurately on a sort of bums on seats basis. This reflects more accurately the number of people who would be working under that program as a proportion of the rental charged by SACON.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that the same allocation as last year has been made for the follow-up of unregistered workplaces, yet legislation that passed in Parliament gave the Minister the authority to have the workplace registration fee included in the premiums for workers compensation. Why will so many people apply their mind to this issue when it was agreed in Parliament that workers compensation returns would provide a far more accurate reflection of workplace incidents and thus the department would not have to spend all this money and time chasing up the 10 000 workplaces yet to be listed?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The amending Bill provided for the Workers Compensation Commission to collect the workplace registration fee. It also provided that information be given to the Department of Labour. In terms of that information becoming available, these workplaces must still be inspected.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is true, but the department is aware of those workplaces.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: They are not yet known to the Department of Labour. Information is yet to come from the workers compensation tribunal in that regard.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am a little shattered, because I understood that, once the change I had been pushing for over some time was enshrined in legislation, fewer resources would be devoted to this area. I have already put one case before the Minister where an employee did not receive a reminder notice and consequently had an altercation with the department. Some people are not happy about duplication of effort. I can only hope that this matter will be sorted out and that resources will not be wasted in following up something that should not have to be followed up. How many inspections were undertaken in 1988-89 by the various arms of the inspectorate as compared to 1987-88? I note a reduction in certain areas, and the Chief Executive Officer has explained that that was due to a better allocation of resources. How many investigations were undertaken in 1988-89 as a result of follow-up of notifications of workplace accidents or unsafe practices?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The figures for safety inspections are as follows: Construction safety regulations: work injury, 136; complaints, 246; routine, 4 151; asbestos, 212; total, 4 750. Industrial safety code regulations: work injury, 1 110; complaints, 462; routine, 3 041; asbestos, 85; initial visits, 229; total, 4 961. Commercial safety code regulations: work injury, 89; complaints, 103; routine, 1 023; defaults, 7; initial visits, 226; total, 1 448.

Rural industries regulations: work injury, 11; complaints, 2; routine, 441; initial visits, 17; making a total of 471. Logging industry regulations: work injury 4; complaints, 5; routine, 213; making a total of 222. Pesticide regulations: complaints, 5; routine, 223; and initial visits, 12. No prescribed regulations: work injury, 25; complaints, 8; routine, 40; default, 5; initial, 7; making a total of 85.

Total safety regulations: work injury, 1 375; complaints, 831; routine, 9 132; defaults, 51; asbestos, 297; initial visits, 491; making a total of 12 177. In addition to the above inspections, there were 4 569 inspections under the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act and 1 886 under the Dangerous Substances Act, making a total of 6 455.

In relation to awards, the number of complaints substantiated in writing and investigated amounted to 1 345 and the number of calls and visits, which included routine, amounted to 9 404. In relation to long service leave, the number of complaints substantiated in writing and investigated was 78 and the number of calls and visits, including routine, amounted to 540. Shop trading hours involved 229 inspections and workers compensation involved two complaints substantiated in writing and investigated and three calls and visits.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How do these numbers compare with the activities during 1987-88?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that those figures would be in *Hansard* of last year.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: How is it intended to clear the backlog of South Australian industrial reports by 30 June 1990 as stated at page 505 of the Program Estimates under 'Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration'?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A special Treasury allocation has been provided to the department for this purpose. The aim of clearing the backlog is to be achieved by publishing back issues in the same quarterly softcover mode which is being used to produce current volumes. Two quarterly volumes for 1989 have already been produced in this softcover format and have been well received by the industrial community. There are considerable cost savings to the department in not having to produce annual volumes in the expensive binding that has been provided in the past.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to the same page under the same program: given the increasing number of applications for re-employment, are delays occurring in the hearing and determination of such claims and what is the lead time for the cases?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Currently, the commission is setting down section 31 matters for preliminary conferences three weeks after the date of filing. It is important to note that this three week lead time is only able to be maintained by using deputy presidents of the commission to hear conferences, as well as commissioners. Matters which do not settle at the conference stage are being set down for arbitration a further nine weeks hence.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: As raised under the program 'Conditions of employment' on page 506, I understand that there are numerous complaints regarding the Industrial Advisory Service. What action is the department taking to provide a better service to its inquirers?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The department's Industrial Advisory Service is one of, if not the, busiest line in the Statelink network, answering in the order of 80 000 inquiries per year in addition to providing a personal inquiry counter and complaint lodgment facility. Inquiries cover the full range of industrial relations matters and are quite complex.

In recent months the acknowledged traffic problem has been reviewed in conjunction with the Statelink network and action to improve the service within resource limitations has been taken which includes: the appointment of two additional operators who are presently engaged in on-the-job training whilst assisting in the service; the introduction of a recorded bulletin board message containing items of general information to which callers are referred when all operators are engaged. (This new feature which senior officers may control and vary at any time, is expected to satisfy a number of inquirers, thus further freeing-up access for more specific personal callers) and in peak periods, a further recorded message will advise callers of off-peak periods during which quicker access may be obtained.

The network is still being monitored to assess effectiveness and will be reviewed as necessary. It must be acknowl-

edged, however, that the demand may always be such that some delays will occur. It is a situation experienced by most similar services in other States.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Given the advice that the Minister's department receives about injuries in the workplace, was there an increasing incidence of those notifications during 1988-89 compared with 1987-88? The Minister has already confirmed that during the first half of this year there was an unusually high incidence of death. Was this also reflected in the number of injuries that were sustained in the work place?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Because that question is quite complex, we will provide the information in a written report.

Mr INGERSON: How many safety representatives went through the UTLC training area in 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In relation to the United Trades and Labor Council, 1 170; the Trade Union Training Authority, 375; the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 97; the National Safety Council, 80; and the South Australian Employers Federation, 8.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, how many deputies were involved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That relates to the representatives and deputies who were trained during the period.

Mr INGERSON: Does the Minister receive audited statements of yearly accounts for the Workers Health Centre?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have insisted that audited statements be received from all bodies that receive grants from the Department of Labour. My Director assures me that that is being complied with. If they do not provide an audited report, they do not receive a further grant.

Mr INGERSON: How many prohibition and improvement notices were issued during 1988-89? Were any difficulties experienced, and how many of these were contested?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have been advised that prohibition notices were issued, and that that included unsafe machinery, 69; unsafe electrical plant or equipment, 13; unsafe scaffolding, 11; unsafe access, 6; unsafe working environment general, 40; unsafe use of chemicals, 2; and other excavations, 6. In relation to improvement notices issued by inspectors, they related to defective guarding of machinery, 257; unsafe electrical plant or equipment, 18; unsafe access, 26; unsafe plant or equipment, 52; lack of welfare facilities, 48; unsafe working environment general, 133; and other, 5. My advice is that one may have had a commenced objection but that was later withdrawn.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I have two short questions. On page 501 of the Program Estimates there is reference to 'Equal opportunity for women: women at work', and there is a proposal for two average full-time equivalent positions for the year under discussion. What do those two persons actually do?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I ask Ms Callinan to advise the Committee.

Ms Callinan: The two members of the department's Women's Advisers Unit are the Women's Adviser and a senior project officer. Their broad brief is to advise the Government on legislative and administrative initiatives which reflect the changing needs and priorities of women in the South Australian work force, and to develop policies and strategies that will address those needs.

They have a brief to monitor the incidence and severity of occupationally caused injuries and diseases suffered by the South Australian work force and, in particular, the women in that work force, and to make contributions to the development of appropriate standards for those women. They have a brief to ensure that the practices, conditions and policies which impede the participation of women in

the work force on a basis comparable with that of men are identified and eliminated.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am grateful for that information. I need to make a short statement before asking my next question. One of the most common matters raised in my electorate office, which is based in St Marys and which is surrounded by light and medium industry, relates to contact with women workers in various industries who came to my office usually on other matters and who get many work related burns, both from work friction and the fact that much of the material they trim involves airblown plastic moulding, hot material and similar products. It seems that this area needs careful policing. One of the duties of the two people concerned is to try to monitor the incidence of injury in the workplace, and so on. These are not major disabling injuries, but they are certainly painful and sometimes may have caused women whom I know of to give up their employment. I thought that this was a good opportunity to bring the matter before the people who may be able to do something about it.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The comments made by the member are worthwhile. Whether male or female employees are injured, we can make a special effort to look at the situation. I imagine that the injuries referred to occur in the rubber and plastic moulding areas. That means the South Australian Rubber Mills or Bridgestone, as it is now known.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: And Seeley Brothers, who have air conditioning contracts with Arabian countries.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We can have inspectors call and make a special point of examining conditions.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It would be worthwhile. I am not singling out Seeley Brothers, because in other ways they are not a bad employer. It seems that the kind of practices required—it is mostly female employees doing such work as trimming—need to be more thought out involving, for example, better gloving, and so on.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is also to do with a change in the process.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: On page 500 of the Program Estimates, under 'Air pollutants, (dust, smoke, asbestos, etc)', we propose as in the past an average of one full-time equivalent in that area. Where does the demarcation line occur between the environment and duties under the Clean Air Act and the Health Act?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the Director to respond to that question.

Mr Bachmann: Our responsibilities are in the workplace and if there is any concern about air pollutants, dust, smoke or other fumes, we would deal with that question in the Department of Labour. If it is external to the workplace and in the general environment, then it comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Environment and Planning. Inside the factory it is our responsibility: external to that it is the Department's responsibility.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Returning to the question of the training of safety representatives, the Minister will remember that I raised two matters with the Committee last year, first, the uneven stance taken by the Government in respect of funding training courses run by the UTLC but providing no funds for any other courses, irrespective of who was running them, and secondly, the problems associated with allowing people to participate in whatever course they so desired, irrespective of whether or not it had union affiliation. Can the Minister say whether he has given further consideration to funding other than union courses? Secondly, have the problems been ironed out as to the demar-

cation, if you like, with respect to who could do what training.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: A total of five courses have been approved. They are conducted by the UTLC, the Trade Union Training Authority, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the National Safety Council and the South Australian Employers Federation. It is my advice at the moment that there are no problems as to who attends what course. With respect to funding, my advice is that only one application for funding which is applicable to the past or current financial year was received by the department, but it arrived too late to be considered. I also believe that the unions do not have the funds to train their members and no funds are made available, but there are plenty of funds provided by the employers to ensure that their managers are trained. It is very important in this complex area of occupational safety, health and welfare that the workers' representatives have access to an alternative form of training, one in which they have some trust, and that can only be the one conducted by the UTLC.

Further, my advice is that the courses are approved by the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Commission and the employee representatives in their training courses are training on a similar curriculum, and the attitudes being expressed are very similar. I have spoken to workers' representatives who have been to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry course and they have attitudes very similar to the one of the council. It is very important that the unions have that choice. I am also of the view that the course provided by the UTLC and the general training and safety people can only ensure that, over a long period of time, the more people who are trained, the safer the workplaces will be in South Australia. One only has to visit workplaces to see the different levels of safety applying. If properly trained, supervisors, workers or managers will ensure that people conduct themselves in a safe working manner. I saw that the other day in a workplace. When one walks around and sees other workplaces, it makes one think, from experience, what could happen there. In some areas they are well aware of the dangers and are prepared to take action, but others are not. We need to ensure that more and more people are trained.

If we reach the stage in South Australia where each of our 660 000 workers has been through some sort of safety training, we can then expect to see a great reduction in accidents and a great improvement in safe working places. It is one problem that confronts the rural community in that they are mainly self employed people, living at their workplace. We have attempted to address that matter in consultation with the United Farmers and Stockowners, and the department is running a series of articles in the *Stockowners Journal* setting out safety procedures in certain situations. The department knows that that is successful because of the extraordinary number of phone calls it is receiving in rural areas with respect to safety and particularly with respect to its recent articles. We hope that peer group pressure in the farming community will reduce that alarming incidence.

For the benefit of the Committee, I was advised by the Country Fire Services Director that recently three volunteer firemen who were attending a farmer's fire in his shed were overcome by fumes. My first response was: why did they bother to go there? He blinked and looked. When I made that comment to a farmer, he could not understand my response: why go there, why not just contain the fire in the shed? It is something that people on farming properties do not really appreciate. A farming property has a large number of activities undertaken by a farmer in one year. He could

be using the tractor and the implements attached to it, which are quite dangerous. In fact, 37 per cent of machinery injuries occur with tractors or equipment attached to them. In a farmer's shed one is likely to find a complex range of chemicals which, in their stable form within their containers, are quite safe if handled in accordance with the rules. However, if mixed together or burnt, one has no idea of the resultant fumes. Fortunately, these three people recovered, but there is a lack of understanding which leads me, the department and the Government to believe that education at all levels will be successful.

A farmer died recently at Olary when he attempted to cut a 44 gallon drum that contained, I think, petrol. In the course of doing that, he ignited the fumes inside the drum and suffered enormous burns to his body, and died two or three days later. One of the things you are supposed to learn during a safety course is that, if ever you wish to cut a 44 gallon drum that has contained petrol or an inflammable liquid, the first thing you do is fill the drum with water. It is a very simple thing to remember. If this farmer had filled it with water, he would be alive today. The fact that he did not know that he should fill it with water has resulted in his killing himself. I am sure he did not intend to do that. That is the important thing: people need to know the safe way to do something. That is why these training programs are very important. That is why the UTLC training program is very effective. Workers want to go to it. Unions want to ensure that their members go to it. I do not think employers are complaining about people going to the UTLC training course, because people coming away from it are better equipped to handle problems in the workplace.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What percentage of safety representatives and their deputies have received training through an approved course?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission has received over 7 000 notification of election forms from health and safety representatives and deputy health and safety representatives. Approximately 6 000 of these are health and safety representatives, the remainder being deputy representatives. A quarter of health and safety representatives and a third of deputy representatives are female, and 1 730 were trained last financial year.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can we conclude that about one-third of safety representatives have received some form of training through one of the courses?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is fair to say that the number of people trained represents about a third of those currently appointed; it does not mean that a third who are currently appointed have been trained.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Page 508 of the Program Estimates contains figures relating to the number of improvement notices issued. Do those figures relate to inspections or to improvement notices? If they relate to improvement notices, there is a large problem in relation to dangerous substances. If it relates to the number of inspections, do those figures apply for 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That page contains a typing error. The words 'number of improvement notices issued' should be deleted. It refers only to inspections.

Mr S.J. BAKER: How many situations discovered last financial year by inspectors did they regard as being dangerous? What were the chemicals involved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: One improvement notice was issued. I am advised that that was in respect of a paint factory.

Mr S.J. BAKER: At page 510, the Program Estimates state:

Monitor leave provisions for workers with family responsibilities and support initiatives to achieve legislative reform in this area.

The Act was amended last session. What does this statement signify?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Government has supported the Australian Council of Trade Unions' case for parental leave. If and when that is finalised, and if it is successful for the ACTU, we will see whether it can apply in South Australia. We will also look at paternity leave in South Australian awards where currently it does not apply.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The only area we are talking about is maternity leave?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Paternity and maternity leave. The ACTU case is an application for paternity leave. Maternity leave does not apply in a number of South Australian awards.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What about paternity leave?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That only applies in the Public Service.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will you seek to extend that?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will wait and see the outcome of the ACTU's application.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In principle, does the Government support the extension of paternity leave to all other areas of employment?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Government has yet to make a decision in that area.

Mr TYLER: I refer to page 507 of the Program Estimates. How many field inspectors are employed in the Department of Labour? In which regions are they employed? How many inspections were made last financial year to determine compliance with the legislation?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I answered such a question from the member for Mitcham.

Mr TYLER: How many prosecutions were initiated by the department during 1988-89 and 1987-88 for breaches of the Act and regulations?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Since January this year the level of fines has increased dramatically to where I think it appropriately reflects the intention of the Act. I am of the view that, in time, those heavy fines will have a significant effect on the companies in their application of occupational health and safety programs in their workplaces. An international magazine reported the case of ICI in the United Kingdom, where several years ago it was fined £1 000 for breaches of occupational safety and health regulations. The £1 000 in respect to ICI's overall profit for that year did not register as a dot on its annual report.

However, the humiliation of being prosecuted and convicted was sufficient to ensure that other large companies in the United Kingdom reorganised their occupational safety and health sections to ensure that they were never prosecuted. Indeed, ICI was galvanised into action; it admitted that it had been a bit slack in the past. I hope that the increasing fines will have a similar effect here because sometimes programs are introduced and revised but not looked at. If one is running a business one has to constantly review what one is doing.

Prosecutions for breaches of the Act and regulations from 1 July 1988 to 30 June 1989 are as follows: for the Industrial Health, Safety and Welfare Act, eight prosecutions were carried forward from the previous year, seven were proceeded with, making a total of 15, with 12 convictions recorded and 23 complaints withdrawn; four industrial safety code cases were carried forward from the previous year, two were proceeded with, making a total of six, with one conviction and five complaints withdrawn.

Construction Safety Code—three carried forward, a total of three; and three complaints withdrawn. Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act provisions under the Act—a total of 24; 21 proceeded with, 12 convictions recorded, two withdrawn and 10 complaints pending at the end of the year. Regulations pursuant to the old Industrial Safety Act—one carried forward, four proceeded with after 1 July, giving a total of five; four withdrawn and one complaint pending. Construction safety—three were carried forward, and three proceeded with, giving a total of six; one conviction recorded and one withdrawn, and four complaints pending. Registration of workplaces—two proceeded with, a total of two, with one conviction recorded and one withdrawn.

Under the Dangerous Substances Act—one proceeded with, making a total of one and one withdrawn. Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—11 carried forward, 49 proceeded with, giving a total of 60; 41 convictions recorded, six withdrawn and 13 pending. Shop Trading Hours Act—two carried forward and 13 proceeded with, giving a total of 15; 12 convictions recorded, two complaints withdrawn and one carried forward. Workers Compensation Act—one carried forward, making a total of one and one conviction recorded.

The amount of fines in each case was as follows: Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 12 convictions with fines of \$2 100; industrial safety code regulations, one conviction with a fine of \$300; Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, 12 convictions with fines totalling \$43 750; construction safety, a number of convictions, one conviction with no penalty; and, registration of workplaces, one conviction with a \$250 fine.

The non-reporting of accidents gave one conviction with a fine of \$250; Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 41 convictions, 19 with no penalty, making \$3 490; Shop Trading Hours Act, 12 convictions with fines totalling \$3 870. The Workmen's Compensation Act had one conviction with a fine of \$400, making a total of 82 convictions with total fine revenue of \$54 410.

Mr TYLER: How many fatal accidents occurred in industrial premises or on construction sites during 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Fourteen reportable fatal accidents occurred under departmental jurisdiction: at Port Adelaide a worker was killed when a load of pipes fell from a forklift truck; at Edwardstown a worker was electrocuted at electroplating premises; at Henley Beach a worker was crushed by a reversing truck driven by his brother; at Virginia a 5-year-old child died as a result of a fall from a tractor; at Wayville a painter fell from a scaffold; at Port Stanvac a worker died whilst working underwater on construction work; at Mundulla a 3-year-old girl died as a result of a fall from a tractor; at Mile End a worker died when he fell through fragile roofing material; at Henley Beach a worker died when the forklift he was operating capsized; at Osborne a worker died after falling 17.6 metres off structural steel; at Angaston a worker died when the tractor he was driving rolled, trapping and crushing him; at Morphett Vale a worker died when gelignite he was using to break concrete exploded; at Woodcroft a person (Director) died after receiving an electric shock whilst using an electric hand drill; and at Riverton a worker died when the bulldozer he was driving rolled over at the Riverton rubbish tip.

Mr TYLER: Does that represent an increase or a decrease over the previous period?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is a slight increase. In the previous financial year there were seven.

Mr TYLER: Has the Register of Work Places maintained by the Department of Labour been reconciled with the lists of workplaces registered with WorkCover?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Before WorkCover would release its information on workplace registration, it was necessary to make relevant sections of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act operable—a somewhat drawn out procedure. This has now been done and information from WorkCover is expected any day, after which the reconciliation process will begin. It is anticipated that this process will result in the identification of between 10 000 and 15 000 workplaces which should be paying workplace registration fees but are not currently doing so.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to equal opportunity for women, there is reference under program 7 to liaising with union and employer groups to facilitate the removal of discriminatory provisions of State awards. Does this include minimum hours of work, permanent part-time work, gender language, etc.? Why is it taking so long, and is there some union movement to oppose the reform?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: This is a very complex problem that will take a long time to resolve. I hope that the award restructuring resulting from the recent decision of the Industrial Relations Commission and the much awaited decision of the South Australian Industrial Commission in relation to award restructuring will hasten its progress. There has been some reluctance on the part of all parties to any changes in awards, and it is a matter of convincing all parties.

We see a golden opportunity to do this when everything is up for examination, and to do it when they come for award restructuring. One of the other impediments is that, when awards are being varied, it is done between the parties when dealing with the more mundane matters of money in some selected working conditions, which will be of advantage to either the employers or the employees.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister provide details of the days lost through industrial disputation on building sites for 1988-89, and how does this compare with 1987-88?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Labour in South Australia cannot do that: it is a matter that is collected by either the Australian Bureau of Statistics or the Department of Industrial Relations. I understand that it is usually collected on a basis of their ringing up either the employer or the unions to ascertain how many people were on strike and for how long.

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister advise the Committee what, in his opinion, is the overall contribution of building disputation to total days lost?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: He cannot.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister advise which consultancy cost \$14 400 in 1988-89, and whether is it planned to continue into 1989-90?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The consultancies approved in 1988-89 were as follows: social survey consultants, involving a staff survey of career, training and employment issues, at a cost of \$4 950; joint venture consultancies, initial project Department of Labour only, at a cost of \$6 000; and the follow-up project with the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations, at a cost of \$2 750. At the moment, no firm decision has been made about any consultancies for the current financial year.

Mr INGERSON: From where did the grant for the Migrant Workers Centre emanate, and is similar accountability required?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: All grants by the Department of Labour are made on the condition that the recipient provide an audited statement of the accounts showing how the grant

has been expended. That is the condition that both the department and I require and is clearly spelt out. The grant to the United Trades and Labor Council for the Migrant Workers Centre emanated from the Immigrant Workers Task Force report. The grant was made on the condition that brief quarterly update reports on the project and financial statements showing expenditure to date were forwarded to the department within one month of the end of each quarter. In addition, a detailed report and audited financial statement are required within two months of the end of the financial year detailing expenditure to 30 June.

Mr INGERSON: Is the funding State or Federal?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am talking about what I am responsible for—State funding. I have no idea what the Federals do.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note (page 501 of the Program Estimates) that last year \$131 000 was allocated for non-legislative policy development, \$117 000 was expended and \$554 000 has been allocated this year. However, there has been no corresponding increase in the number of average full-time equivalents: in fact, there is a small reduction. Does that indicate greater use of consultancies?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That involves a grant to the Workplace Resource Centre of \$365 000.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note that that sum appears elsewhere in the Estimates of Payments.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It comes under that program.

Mr S.J. BAKER: A previous question related to industrial disputation. The Program Estimates (page 511) details the number of days lost per 1 000 employees in South Australia from 1985-86 to 1988-89. The Minister informed the Committee that no details were available regarding the building industry. Have those details been collected from the Commonwealth? I am assured that they are available. If the details are available to the Minister's Department, will he provide that information prior to the close of business on 29 September?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: When I responded to the member for Mitchell I made quite clear that we did not collect such information. We can ask the Australian Bureau of Statistics whether it has that information and, if it has, we will make it available. If the member for Mitcham knows that the information is available, why did he not get it?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I make the point to the Minister that departments can obtain certain information that—

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In that case, why did the honourable member wait to ask a question in this Committee? Why did he not write a letter when the idea struck him?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Let us get back to a question and answer format.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am making some observations. This is an Estimates Committee. I would have thought that, if the Minister was not aware of the contribution of industrial disputation in a key industry in South Australia, he would make himself aware and thus he could make the Committee aware of the situation. Disruption on building sites has been ongoing in South Australia, and I would have expected the Minister to have that information at his fingertips. Does he not care? The Minister should have been able to provide the Committee with information on where industrial disruption has taken place in the past four years in each of the industries in South Australia. Part of his job is employee relations. A number of areas come under the category of improving rapport in the workplace, but the Minister is saying that he does not really care.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Mitcham is saying that; he should understand that we are here to examine the expenditure of the department, and that does not

involve collection of statistics. That is undertaken by a Commonwealth department. Those statistics are made available to the general public of South Australia each month. I proffer the advice that, if the member for Mitcham is so concerned, he could have asked for the information, particularly given his advice to the Committee, since he knew it was available. As the honourable member is unable to write letters, we will do that for him.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Two or three years ago when problems were besetting the ASER site it was mooted that a person with the confidence of both the unions and of management act as arbiter, but that proposal did not get off the ground. Has further consideration been given to the appointment of an industrial go-between on sites around Adelaide, given the continuing difficulties experienced on a number of sites, particularly in the Adelaide area?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No, because neither of the parties involved in the ASER site wanted it, and no parties involved in other building sites in Adelaide have sought that type of assistance. When they have sought assistance, it has been provided.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Did all of the \$365 000 for the South Australian Workplace Resource Centre come from the Commonwealth? Secondly, over what time period has the Commonwealth made a commitment to that centre? Thirdly, where will the centre be located? Fourthly, what is to be achieved at that centre (and I believe that the Minister referred to that previously)? Fifthly, will the centre cut across some of the work currently being undertaken by the Centre for Manufacturing?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The \$365 000 is for one year, and the South Australian contribution will be up to that sum. The Commonwealth commitment of funding for the centre is for three years. It is proposed to site the centre at Netley, but I am not sure whether or not that will occur because that is a decision for the centre's management committee. The role of the centre is to assist employers and employees to reach agreement in respect of workplace restructuring, particularly award restructuring. I have been fortunate enough to be involved in discussions with union representatives and some employers on this matter and, while some have much knowledge on what the change is about, others have only a superficial knowledge.

I commented in another forum that, if restructuring was not undertaken properly, even the most efficient shop steward could muck it up. Workers, front line supervisors and managers must be trained in what this restructuring means. I make the point that, if we are not successful in award restructuring (and, incidentally, this involves methods of work and how it is conducted in the workplace), we will find Australian manufacturing industry disappearing further down the chute. Only in this way will we be able to train people to perform the tasks required and meet the challenges in the manufacturing industry in the next 10 to 20 years. We will just not survive unless we do that.

That is why this centre has been established and I hope that it will be successful. My advice is that, while some people could say that there is a conflict between this centre and the Centre for Manufacturing, there has been a deliberate attempt to ensure that representatives from both centres are involved in the management of each centre and consequently they are trying to ensure that they do not work at cross purposes; in other words, there will be a demarcation as to their work.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I propose to deal with 'Support Services' at page 513 of the Program Estimates. First, I note that the department was one of eight agencies involved in the Commissioners Review of the Principles of Personnel

Management. This included a review of selection techniques. The Minister will be aware that I earlier demonstrated an interest in the selection techniques at the base level for clerical people entering the Public Service. Has that review come to any conclusions that are available and upon which he can comment?

Mr Bachmann: We were one of the eight agencies involved and we were jointly reviewed by us and by the Commissioner for Public Employment. The result of that review was fairly favourable for our agency, but it has resulted in our undertaking further training in staff selection techniques. We have a policy of having a staff representative on each panel. However, staff turnover then creates the continual problem of training people in those techniques so as to make better decisions in selections. We came out of the review reasonably well, but it also pointed out that we should conduct more staff training in those techniques.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: That same page refers to the fact that one of the targets is to investigate possible work force planning initiatives to address flexibility, mobility and development of staff. I understand that under the conditions of employment there are facilities for mobility and development of staff. However, I was interested in the inclusion of the word 'flexibility'.

Mr Bachmann: This objective for next year resulted from a general work force planning report for the whole public sector which concluded that we should address, a little more accurately, the requirements for the next few years because of the shortage of staff, turnover of staff, and so on. Because of the current trend towards specialisation of the work force, the question of flexibility was also to be investigated. That seems to tie in with the restructuring exercise where multi-skills and more skills are being added to people's duties to enable them to enjoy work a little more and also to make them more flexible across the work force in any organisation in which they work.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Page 513 of the Program Estimates also states:

Acquire a new computer facility and transfer current applications within the 18 months stipulated by Government direction. Review the effectiveness of existing computer resources within the department.

I do not know whether that has been set out in order of priority, but I would have thought that it would be advantageous first to undertake the review before embarking on the acquisition of a new computer facility.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Justice Information System was referred to earlier today. Two programs on that system affect the Department of Labour: one is the register of dangerous substances and the other is award information. The Department of Labour is anxious to obtain that information from the Justice Information System so that it will be located on a system that stands alone and can be easily accessed by other organisations.

In relation to award information, we hope to be able to provide a service for a fee by selling a list, which has been obtained from the computer, that sets out award conditions. We envisage the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Employers Federation, the United Trades and Labor Council and unions that undertake a lot of work in the commission being prepared to pay a fee to have direct line access to these awards which will be immediately updated when a decision is made.

In relation to dangerous substances, I cite the case of the fire at Frewville when it was believed that toxic fumes might endanger lives, so people were evacuated. However, it was subsequently found that such an action was somewhat alarmist.

Nevertheless, the precautions taken would have ensured that no lives were endangered. There is now a requirement that a register of all hazardous chemicals be kept at one central location so that, when an emergency arises, fire-fighters can obtain the information and begin to take appropriate action. If that information is maintained on a database that is easily accessible by the Metropolitan Fire Service or the Country Fire Service, it would be possible for fire-fighters to obtain information about dangerous chemicals as they proceed to the emergency. Fire officers do have fax machines in their units so, if this proposal were implemented, they could obtain information from headquarters and then plan appropriate action en route to the scene. If the situation warranted it, they could request that additional appliances and equipment be forwarded to the emergency or the fire so that when they arrive at the scene that back-up equipment is provided within a short period.

An increasing amount of hazardous chemicals are being kept in workplaces and, in many cases, fumes indicate what chemicals are burning, but it is very important that this information be made available. I do not know whether this proposal would be cost effective, but how much is a fire-fighter's life worth? The other cost relates to existing personal computers within the department and improving efficiency.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In my last question about the South Australian Work Place Resource Centre the Minister recited the benefits and the imperatives of achieving award restructuring. I am sure that the Minister noted the fact that the Opposition agreed on the need for award restructuring and the need for it to happen sooner rather than later. However, my question related to the range of services that will be provided at the Work Place Resource Centre and what specific areas will be of benefit to employers in this State.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It will help employees and employers to achieve appropriate award restructuring, because they will need assistance from competent people. The Engineering Employers Association of South Australia, which is involved with the Metal Trades Industry Association, would be recognised as being well advanced in relation to award restructuring. It is one of the strongest advocates for establishing this centre. A number of its members will need extensive assistance. The unions also recognise that their members will need assistance also. However, I cannot say how it will be conducted, because the centre is being managed by a board comprising representatives from the South Australian Government, the Commonwealth and industry.

They will make the decisions about management. A number of people have views on how they ought to conduct their business but, from what I know of the people who are currently appointed, they will ensure that it is done efficiently. This will be done at an enterprise level—in other words, at each workplace where it takes place. It is a difficult job. One only has to have some experience in industry to know that the demarcations between trades are not the same as one moves from one workplace to another.

All this will be broken down, but not overnight by someone saying, 'You will do it.' As everyone in this place knows, whenever one mentions change there is a group of people who do not want to be involved in it. As to the change taking place in industry in respect of award restructuring, it is vast and will upset things that have been in place for the past 100 years. Award procedures have been established for the past 80 years. It will not happen overnight and it will not happen without the assistance of people who are highly skilled in helping workers and managers in the various workplaces.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would now like to address the question of workers compensation in the Government sector. I refer to the information in the Auditor-General's Report and in the Program Estimates at page 512. The explanation of the increase in claims for 1988-89 is that workers seem to know more about their rights, so that claims have gone up. Has the Minister a far more suitable explanation than that for the Committee?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I refer the member for Mitcham to page 512 of the Program Estimates. The difference between 1987-88 and 1988-89 is about 387 claims out of 5 740 claims, which is not a big increase. It is generally accepted that, with general information becoming available about how these systems work, people will take advantage of those systems and will report injuries. Furthermore, the Government is encouraging people to report all injuries, because then it can have proper monitoring of what is happening in the workplace.

I would also like to make the point that well managed workplaces also manage injury levels well. Whilst that small increase is deplorable, it is an indication that people are more aware of their rights and are making applications. Members will find that sort of thing with the application of statistics generally in respect of occupational health, safety and welfare, and also WorkCover, which has advertised the availability of its services. More people in private industry will apply for benefits if they believe that their injuries were received at work. It is then up to WorkCover to determine whether or not the injury was received at work.

These statistics indicate a small increase. Reviewing the position, I note that in 1985-86 there were 6 739 claims; in 1986-87 there were 6 396 claims; in 1987-88 there were 5 740—a considerable drop; there was a small increase in 1988-89 to 6 127 claims, still well below the 6 739 claims of 1985-86.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister highlighted the reduced number of claims in 1988-89, but changes in the legislation were in effect which would have contributed to the lower number of claims as a result of how workers compensation was handled at that time. In the stress area, in terms of total claims the increase is relatively small, but the area is horrifically expensive. We have only a pie graph in front of us, but it appears that 400 stress claims were involved in 1988-89, with payments totalling \$5.067 million. If those figures related to the same period, it would indicate an average cost of about \$12 000 a claim, which is about three or four times higher than any other area covered under the chart shown on page 123 of the Auditor-General's Report. The stress claims are particularly high in the Education Department, where they comprise about 50 per cent of the claims, and in the Correctional Services Department such claims have increased from 7 per cent to 17 per cent of all claims. Can the Minister explain what his department is doing about this outbreak?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: First, the department is aware of it. The matter is of considerable concern to the Department of Labour and the departments where this incidence is happening. The department is looking at strategies, first, to ensure that people cannot become stressed at work. The other strategy being looked at is how to handle these people when they are subject to a workers compensation claim caused by stress. Discussions are taking place with the departments involved. It is a complex problem. It is difficult to deal with it at this stage and my advice is that that applies to everyone who is confronted with it.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: At page 506 of the Program Estimates I see that it is proposed as one of the specific targets for the year under discussion to review the Explo-

sives Act and regulations with the purpose of writing a new Act and regulations. Is that the result of some concern by the department and the Minister about the existing Act, or is it just prudence applying at this stage?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Something is happening called 'the effluxion of time'. The Act has been around for a while and needs to include modern terms. We have a regulation review committee which examines all regulations, and the regulations need to be re-examined and reproduced in accordance with its recommendations. As in other areas, we have Acts around that were passed in the year that I was born being reviewed, and it is appropriate that we do that.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: When I was a Minister I had the opportunity to visit the Dry Creek magazine and see the safety procedures in force. I had some connection with the magazine because of my involvement with two services some years ago. I was satisfied with the procedures that applied at the storage and so on. I have a small concern about the overall security because, taking into account that one needs a suitably remote location for such facility, to some extent it lends itself to a clandestine approach. I understand if the Minister does not want to outline publicly what security provisions prevail, but I would be happy if an assurance that there was security was given.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: People need to know what we are doing. We are building a new perimeter fence which we hope will make it difficult for people to scale. We are also installing a new electronic surveillance system. Progress is slower than anticipated, because it has been wet. Members can appreciate that the magazine is in a low lying area which is subject to flooding. Some areas have samphire swamp on them. There is that similar sort of situation and, as soon as the earthmoving equipment can build the appropriate mounds, and so on, the fence will be erected. The passive infra red detection systems have been purchased and will be installed. When that is done, we are confident that that level of security will be much higher than it has been in the past. I understand that in recent times, there have been no illegal entries. This occurred last when fire-works were installed on the premises and the intruder was apprehended.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Returning to the worker's compensation area for the Government, a great deal was made of the Alan Bruce Risk Management System which had been introduced into five departments, if my memory serves me correctly. The Department of Marine and Harbors was one area covered by the scheme. Can the Minister report whether any departments have shown an increase in claims under the Alan Bruce Risk Management System, or has there proved to be in each of the five cases a result against the trend, reducing the number of accidents or injuries occurring?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I think it was called a mixed bag. Five departments are involved in the Alan Bruce Risk Management Scheme. Referring to the Department for Community Welfare, in 1986-87 there were 127 claims; in 1987-88, 176 claims; and in 1988-89, 96 claims; a percentage change of plus 11.7. In the Engineering and Water Supply Department, there were 1 038 claims in 1986-87; 916 in 1987-88; and 854 in 1988-89; a percentage of minus 6.8.

In the Department of Technical and Further Education, there were 254 claims in 1986-87; 223 in 1987-88; 230 in 1988-89, a percentage change of plus 3.1. In the Department of Marine and Harbors, there were 234 claims in 1986-87; 186 in 1987-88; and 237 in 1988-89; a percentage change of plus 27.4. Finally, in the Department of Housing and Construction, there were 473 claims in 1986-87; 431 in 1987-88; and 401 in 1988-89; a change of minus 7.4 per cent. In

total, there were 2 126 in 1986-87; 1 934 in 1987-88; and 1 918 in 1988-89; a change of minus .8 per cent.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Two departments actually went backwards under that scheme. Has the scheme been fully evaluated, and is the Government satisfied that it is a very useful component in the fight against injury and disease in the workplace? If so, why have not more departments been introduced to it?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Alan Bruce Risk Management Scheme has been in operation in a limited number of departments for a limited period of time. It is fair to say that it has applied in the Department of Marine and Harbors for three years but only one year in the rest. I have a personal interest in what is happening in the Department of Marine and Harbors, and my advice is that, when a department achieves a marked success with this scheme, (and that happened in the Department of Marine and Harbors), there is a tendency on the part of the workers to relax their vigilance. That has caused renewed efforts on the part of officers in the department, and it is being considered by the Department of Labour in the application of both occupational health and safety and Government worker's compensation. It means that we will keep the incidence and costs down.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The statistics are equivocal, and I note the Minister's explanation about the long term benefits of the scheme. The statistics are not quite clear on whether or not there has been a real improvement, because the Minister says three in one case, two in another and one in another. Why has it remained in just those five departmental areas if, as the former Minister originally said, he was quite excited by the scheme and its potential? Can the Minister explain why it has not caught on in other areas?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is very simple. There is a limit to what one person can do. All that Alan Bruce could do was implement the scheme in the five departments. The Department of Labour is developing another scheme called Pentstar, which is similar to the Alan Bruce Risk Management Scheme. That is a development of risk management which, when applied in the various Government departments, will be just as effective, and it will be happening in the New Year. The Department of Correctional Services will be one of the first departments in which Pentstar will be applied.

Mr S.J. BAKER: All members would have noted the shortfall in the funds for 1988-89, and I draw the Minister's attention to the balance of funds as at 1 July 1988 being \$9.517 million. The premiums were \$30.044 million and the costs or payments for the 1988-89 year were \$31.615 million, meaning that the funds diminished by about \$1.6 million. Can the Minister explain why the departments have under provided to the fund?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the Director to address that question.

Mr Bachmann: As the member pointed out, when the fund opened on 1 July, there was a balance of \$9.517 million. To meet the expected claims in 1988-89, premiums of \$30 million were added to it, making a total of \$39 million, of which \$31 million was spent, leaving a balance of approximately \$8 million for the commencement of this financial year. This year the expected claims incorporate the balance of the fund at the beginning of the year as well as premiums paid during the year. If one increases the premiums for the expected settlement of claims, one would be forever increasing the balance in the fund.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is it intended to run the fund down to zero?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Given the increase in the use of autogas and the proposed introduction of natural gas fuel for vehicles, what steps will be taken to ensure that legislation reflects the current needs and safety standards?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The combined Natural Gas for Vehicles/Liquefied Petroleum Gas Working Committee was formed to address the problems involved with the introduction of compressed natural gas as a fuel for vehicles. Several meetings have been held and the decision of the committee, which consists of members from industry and Government bodies, was to separate the development of new regulations for compressed natural gas from amendments to existing legislation dealing with liquefied petroleum gas. A green paper for compressed natural gas was prepared for comment by the committee, and draft regulations are being considered for incorporation under the dangerous substances regulations.

The Department of Labour, in conjunction with TAFE, is reviewing the current liquefied petroleum gas regulations in order to reflect changes in the needs of industry and the Government over the past eight years. A green paper addressing liquefied petroleum gas has been drafted and will be circulated in the near future. If natural gas is stored in a liquid form, the pressure is over 3 000 pounds per square inch. That is enormous when one compares it with the pressure of liquid petroleum gas. Consequently, the regulations must be different.

The South Australian Gas Company is at present testing the market for natural gas to be used in motor vehicles. It is supplying compressors to residents who have an appropriate gas tank and manifold control system installed in their motor vehicle so that the tank can be filled overnight. Apparently, it takes all night to fill enough fuel into a vehicle for one day's running.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to page 510 of the Program Estimates, where it is stated that the department has made efforts to reduce the incidence and severity of occupational injury and disease and that it will ensure that these efforts are suitable to the needs of women. What efforts are being made in this regard?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: An important development in the occupational health and safety of women has been the inclusion of hospitals and schools in the coverage of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. The department investigates between 15 per cent and 20 per cent of reported incidents, and account is taken of the nature of the injury and its cause when deciding to investigate. The department's allocation of resources for accident reports and its targeting of risk areas also takes account of gender equity.

As a part of the high priority that the department places on training development, different work situations for men and women are considered during staff training. Of the 32 occupational health and safety inspectors employed by the department, five are women. In addition, the women's adviser, through membership of the Women's Advisory Committee of the Occupational Health and Safety Commission, contributes to the development of occupational health and safety standards and strategies appropriate to women's employment experience.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Both the equal opportunity for women program and the labour policy development program mention the award restructuring process. Will award restructuring have any special implications for women workers?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: As I said earlier, this is a golden opportunity to remove award provisions that are directly discriminatory. It also holds the promise of more credible wages for women and the recognition of job skills, better

training and clear opportunities. One of the problems at the moment is that females in the workforce, particularly in the manufacturing industry, are slotted into and imprisoned in very low-paid and repetitive occupations.

It is hoped that the award restructuring will see those restrictions removed so that women can work throughout the whole range of the manufacturing industry and so that the awards will be changed to give women an opportunity, provided that they have the skills and ability, to do the job of their choice. At the moment many barriers stop women advancing beyond low-paid occupations. We think that award restructuring will change the attitudes of people who work in the industry.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What are the long term liabilities faced by the State Government in relation to workers compensation obligations?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We are unable to indicate that at the moment. The computer that we are obtaining in conjunction with DPIR will allow a system to be developed so that the department can ascertain the liabilities with respect to workers compensation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Every exempt employer is required to conduct an actuarial assessment of their long term liabilities. Why has the Government not complied with this legislation?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: My advice is that as the South Australian Government is exempted by legislation, it is different from other exempt employers. The view can also be taken that if the Government cannot pay its bills, no-one else will be able to do so.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Act is binding on the State Government and the employers which are registered in the State. The Act provides that exempt employers, whether it be the State Government because of its ultimate position or an employer who has been exempted under previous arrangements, shall be assessed each year. The Minister indicated that the State Government has not complied with this legislation and that a computer will come on stream to assist with this matter. I know that the Minister will say that the employers and unions, and not the State Government, are the architects of the scheme. However, I should have thought that the Government would be the first to comply with the requirements of the Act.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I undertake to examine the matter raised by the honourable member.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I gather from the previous information that there have been no deaths in any of the activities carried out by the State Government. Will the Minister confirm that? Will the Minister provide any details as to how the public sector was affected by serious injury during 1988-89?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: From the recollections of the Director, no Government employee was killed at work, but we do not have statistics readily available on serious injury. We will attempt to provide them.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Has any action been taken against any departmental manager for failure to keep a safe workplace?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No formal action has been taken against a departmental head or against any private employer or individual.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I noted that a number of prosecutions were launched, resulting in fines exceeding \$40 000. Will the Minister clarify his previous statement?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That was in response to the questions the honourable member asked. The honourable member asked about departmental heads, and these are companies that are being prosecuted. Companies have been

prosecuted but persons as individuals have not—there may be one pending, but we do not know.

Mr TYLER: What changes are likely to be needed to complement the new Federal Industrial Relations Act?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We have already had one rushed through in the dying stages of the last sitting of Parliament in order to facilitate the hearing of the flow-on of the national wage case. No doubt a number of other modifications will be required, both to the State Act and to its regulations. However, it is unlikely that major modifications will be needed, since the new Federal Act largely resembles the particularly effective South Australian Act.

The one major modification foreseen is an amendment to enable some members of the State tribunal to hold dual appointment as members of both the State and the Federal commission, and *vice versa*. Certainly, we are leading towards greater cooperation and coordination between Federal and State Industrial Commissions. That has been invaluable in dealing with matters in the building industry here, as you Mr Chairman, know.

Some unions are not registered federally and some are, and most of the matters in the building industry here are being dealt with by a State Commissioner, who is using powers given to him by the Commonwealth Act. We think it is an essential part of ensuring a smooth application of industrial laws and regulations in this State.

Mr TYLER: What is the South Australian Government's position with respect to the ACTU's test case on parental leave?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We have intervened with support in principle for the ACTU claim for parental leave provisions in the Federal jurisdiction. The ACTU claims involve 52 weeks of unpaid leave for fathers after the birth, similar to the existing maternity and adoption leave provisions for women in the private sector. Up to three weeks of that leave is available immediately after the birth as a short paternity leave, and the remainder is available at a time of the employee's choice as extended paternity leave.

Fathers and mothers are able to take their extended paternity leave at a time of their choice up to the child's second birthday. Optional part-time leave is available by agreement between the employer and employee. The main feature of the claim is the extension to fathers of unpaid leave provisions which currently exist for mothers. Similar provisions have been available in the South Australian Public Service for some years without having proved to be burdensome and costly.

This fact, and the South Australian endorsement of the International Labour Office Convention 156 on workers with family responsibilities, makes the South Australian Government's in-principle support for the claim highly appropriate. Some reservations concerning terminology used in the claim do not detract from the in-principle support for parental leave on an equitable basis.

Mr TYLER: How reliable is the level of industrial disputation as an indicator of performance in the labour policy development area as shown in the table on page 512?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: South Australia has a very proud record in the continuing low level of industrial disputation. It presently has the lowest number of days lost per 100 000 employees of any State in Australia. In 1988-89 our average number of days lost was 93, compared with an average of 269 in the rest of Australia. That must be attributed in part to sound Government policy.

The aim of labor policy is clearly to maintain a stable environment for productive employment. The most common disruption to this stability is industrial disputation. Because labor policy sets the framework in which any dis-

putes occur, one might reasonably expect the level of disputes to be one significant indicator of the effectiveness of labour policy in South Australia.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would like to pick up the point made previously when I asked whether the Government supported the principle of paternity leave. The answer was not quite straightforward, but now we have heard the Minister clearly state to the Committee that the Government is embracing it wholeheartedly and that it actually intervened in the ACTU case. I wondered whether there has been a change of heart over the past half hour.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Mitcham has blatantly misrepresented me in this matter. He asked me what we were doing in respect of South Australia and I made clear that we were supporting the ACTU case in this matter on principle. When that matter is decided, we will then as a Government decide what we will do in South Australia. That is a sound position which cannot be any different: we cannot make pronouncements as to what we are going to do in South Australia until the matter has been settled at a national level.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thought that the Minister had actually clarified the situation, in that to me it was quite straightforward that he said we had gone to the extent of intervention in respect of the ACTU's case. The Minister said that, should that case be successful, he would then consider what would happen in South Australia. Will the Minister then take a somewhat different stance to his intervention stance on this matter?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If the member for Mitcham is not bright enough to understand it, that is his problem. I have already answered the question and do not intend to enter into any more discussion about it. The honourable member can, but I do not intend to.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It seems that the Minister has one point of view for intervention and another as to the principle. In respect of the \$31.6 million paid out, we got another strange response.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In relation to what?

Mr S.J. BAKER: Workers compensation. The provision for 1988-89 was inadequate. There seemed to be a difference of opinion on whether the funds would be used up or maintained at existing levels. Is it intended to reduce the amount of funds available and purely rely on premium income, or is it intended to keep a surplus of about \$8 million in the fund?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is a pay-as-you-go account. The amounts of the surplus will fluctuate from year to year.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Program Estimates (page 512) suggests that the Government will continue negotiations with WorkCover with the aim of achieving the maximum possible remission of the exempt employer levy. I note that \$2 million was the Crown's contribution towards the administration of the secondary injury fund and the rehabilitation area, which is run by the corporation. According to my calculations that represents less than one-tenth of the premium income currently being paid. Is the State Government falling short with its premium payments even now?

Mr Bachmann: The levy is determined by WorkCover and is submitted to the Government for payment. Remission on that amount of levy is available to exempt employers, depending on what they do as an exempt employer in terms of rehabilitation of injured employees. In each case the levy is determined by WorkCover. It is up to the Government as an employer as to how much it does in terms of rehabilitation and that, in turn, will give it an exemption from part of the levy. The Government does not determine the levy; it is determined by the WorkCover corporation.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I note from the Program Estimates (page 511) that building industry unions were consulted on the Russell report proposal to repeal the Workmen's Liens Act. Will the Minister give some information on the Russell report?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The member for Mitchell may be familiar with the Workmen's Liens Act.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I certainly am, and that is why I want to pursue this matter.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is believed that, if the Act is repealed, there are other methods by which workmen can be paid the money owing to them. I referred the matter to the Industrial Commission and Deputy President Russell prepared a report on the effect of that action, making recommendations regarding that Act. As the Act comes under the auspices of the Attorney-General, the matter is with him. The principal recommendation was that the Act be repealed. The building industry is not happy with that proposal, and the Attorney-General is presently considering the matter. This issue has been around for some time.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: One of the few portfolios in which I have never relieved is the labour area, so I am not familiar with some of those aspects. However, I am familiar with the way in which the Workmen's Liens Act can operate to protect workmen. I well recall a case in my electorate where a lien was still on a home after 26 years because the money had not been paid. It was finally secured, as the land was, of course, still there. While the Act does not provide for speedy action, it has some strength, because that money was collected.

I have been aware recently of cases that were related less to the building side of things and more to work carried out on vehicles. That is now a major industry almost world wide; certainly in the Western world the renovation of older vehicles involves considerable expenditure for the complete renewal of internal upholstery and external paintwork on what we would all describe as fine vehicles of an era gone. We are talking about many thousands of dollars in the Australian scene. In some cases people have tried to avoid payment and have removed the vehicle. Protection exists under the Workmen's Liens Act. I was a little disturbed to read that, but I am happy now that the Minister has said that the matter is being further considered. I hope that my impression was correct.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Has the WorkCover corporation requested the Minister to make legislative changes in regard to older workers?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: To this stage the Minister has received no approach from the Chairman of the board.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Has the Minister approached the board on that matter because of the large amount of correspondence that he would have received from me and other people on this matter? I noted his comments in the House recently.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Nothing has been done to date.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Has the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Office advised the Minister when the bonus and penalty system will be put in place?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Minister has been advised that it is being considered, but has not received explicit advice about when it may make an announcement or a decision. I make the point that the scheme has been operating for about two years and I believe that the next annual report, when it is presented, will demonstrate that the scheme has been operating efficiently, despite the comments of some of its detractors. From the information I have received, I believe that the board will make prudent decisions when the information available to it is appropriate and allows it

to make those prudent decisions. I believe that some people are expecting a little too much within two years.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister alluded to a propitious report being produced this year. One would assume he is aware of the contents of that report. What will the long-term liability of the fund be? The Minister would have noted from last year's report that there was an inbuilt liability in the fund which was not being satisfied. Has that situation improved? The Minister might know that from his discussions with the corporation, given that he said there would be a propitious report. That was one of the areas that threw a cloud over the WorkCover scheme last year.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will make no pronouncement about any report that the board might release until it releases it. I suggest that the member for Mitcham wait for that report with eager anticipation; it will demolish all his criticisms of the operations of the commission.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I can only conclude that either the Minister is privy to information that he does not want to put forward to the Committee or that he is taking the risk of being quite wrong. I guess time will tell. Can the Minister say when that report will be provided to the Parliament?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No, I cannot.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister say when the report will be in the Minister's hands? I understood that the report had to be completed by the end of September.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: No, I cannot. All I can advise the Committee is that, when the report is presented to the Minister, it will be presented to the Parliament.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Under that line an amount was allocated for office machines but not spent. Did that occur because there was a deferral for the larger machine that is being taken in conjunction with the DPIR?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes.

Mr INGERSON: Page 512 of the Program Estimates refers to the fact that negotiations are continuing in relation to exempt employers. The press mentioned some time ago that discussions had taken place and comments were made by the Minister about any further exempt employers. Have any other companies applied for exempt status?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We would not have a clue, because they make that application to WorkCover and not the Minister. The matter which is referred to in the program and to which the member for Bragg referred relates to discussions that the department is having with the WorkCover board.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, what discussions is the Minister having with WorkCover on this matter?

Mr Bachmann: WorkCover determines the levy for the Crown but it has available to it a class of remission, which falls into three classes—A, B and C. We received a remission in accordance with B, and we are negotiating to receive a remission in accordance with A, which is the greatest remission on the levy we are charged.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to program 9 for 1989-90 on page 175 the \$7 million allocation has been shown as a separate item. Is that because the Government, for all previous liabilities, will show that expenditure under that line, or is there some other reason why this figure should appear?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: If the member for Mitcham looks a little further to the left on that page, he will find 'settlement payments' under the Workers Compensation Act 1971. In my opening address I said that the various agencies involved in Government workers compensation were no longer responsible for compensation payable under the old Act, because they could no longer reasonably be expected

to deal with it, and most matters are now dealt with by the Government worker compensation people and Crown Law.

The current Workers Compensation Act requires a strong intervention by the management of various agencies in the occupational health, safety and welfare of the employees, as well as the rehabilitation of those employees if they are injured at work. It is a little difficult to do that when a redundant Act does not provide for rehabilitation or re-employment. That \$7 million has now come into the agency, and I think that it has been separated, quite properly, by the various agencies' accounts. That amount of money will diminish as settlements of workers compensation diminish under the old Act and they are less than what they were last year.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Claims made prior to 1 July 1987 amounted to \$16.7 million in the 1988-89 claim year. How does that \$7 million line up with the previous level of claims?

Mr Bachmann: That \$7 million is paid into the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Fund which was referred to earlier and is added to the current balance of approximately \$8 million in order to make available approximately \$15 million to meet what are expected to be this year's claims for past injuries.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The claims prior to 1 July 1987 amounted to \$16.7 million. If we assume that the level of claims in 1989-90 will follow a similar trend, and we already have \$8 million in the fund with a further \$7 million allocated, nothing will be left in the fund to cover the previous liabilities for those injuries sustained prior to the introduction of the new Act.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: This account to which the member for Mitcham refers is a way of accounting in relation to how we pay compensation for people injured at work. It is a pay-as-you-go fund, which involves allocations by Treasury to the department so that payments can be made. Payments are estimated on the basis of previous years' experience. It is our impression that payment of money under the old Act will diminish. We hope that the actions we undertake in respect of occupational health, safety and welfare will witness a reduction in injury and that increased rehabilitation will mean overall cost reductions to the Government. This fund will not be filled like a hollow log.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note that the responsibility for injury claims under 21 days has been put back to the departments at a cost of about \$3.8 million for 1988-89. Are all departments now responsible for the first 21 days of injury, and will the Government's fund continue to cover the overall liability? Is it intended to make some of the larger individual departments responsible for all their rehabilitation and other processes, and perhaps be exempt employers in their own right?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The various Government agencies cannot be exempt employers in their own right. The Government is the exempt employer. The application for 21 days relates to larger departments that have the facilities to manage. Smaller departments still use the facilities of the Government workers compensation facility. I expect that that will continue and that the management of smaller agencies will continue from the Department of Labour, or any other agency where the Government compensation facility is placed.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have no further questions on the line.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed. I would like to thank the officers who will be leaving us for their patience and attendance throughout the afternoon.

Minister of Labour, Miscellaneous \$911 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott
Mr S.J. Baker
Mr G.A. Ingerson
Mr I.P. Lewis
The Hon. R.G. Payne
Mr P.B. Tyler

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Labour.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr C. Meikle, Chief Executive Officer, South Australian Occupational Health and Safety Commission.
Ms S. Callinan, Acting Women's Adviser.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payment open for examination.

Mr S.J. BAKER: This line to which there is an increased allocation, relates to the Occupational Health and Safety Commission. Can the Minister detail how the extra moneys will be spent?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The allocation results from the employment of three additional staff as well as increased program and capital costs.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister provide details of the 1989-90 structure of the commission in terms of its employees as well as of the areas designated? In which sections will they be performing?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Do you want the names of the officers?

Mr S.J. BAKER: No, but I am interested in the level, the type of functions, and so on.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will provide that information in a written form.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister briefly outline what is the status of the manual handling negotiations?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The draft regulations and code of practice are complete but are awaiting finalisation in the near future of WorkSafe Australia's National Commission Standard Code. The aim is to have uniformity, uniformity between State and national standards. The member for Mitcham would agree that that is a sensible way to go.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have little doubt about that. Can the Minister provide on notice a resume of the areas that will come under the scrutiny of the commission in terms of research and activity in 1989-90?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Marine and Harbors, \$52 727 000

Works and Services—Department of Marine and Harbors,
\$12 600 000

Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous, \$1 533 000

Chairman:

The Hon. T.M. McRae

Members:

The Hon. R.K. Abbott
Mr S.J. Baker

The Hon. Ted Chapman

Mr G.A. Ingerson

The Hon. R.G. Payne

Mr P.B. Tyler

Witness:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory, Minister of Marine.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T. Phipps, Director, CEO, Department of Marine and Harbors.

Mr A. Herath, Director, Administration and Finance.

Mr M. Travers, Chief Finance Officer.

Captain R. Buchanan, Director, Port and Marine Operations.

Mr I. Pascoe, Director, Engineering.

Mr P. Hollister, Acting Director, Commercial.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed payments open for examination.

Mr INGERSON: This question was asked of the Minister of Labour earlier today in relation to sick leave. How much sick leave was taken in the past financial year and how much of this leave was taken on Mondays, Fridays and days immediately before and after holiday weekends? This is my *pro forma* question.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The overall annual average incidence of sick leave absences by departmental employees in the period 1 July 1985 to 31 December 1988 was 7.8 days. This was made up of an average of 5.9 days/FTE/year for GME employees and an average of 9 days/FTE/year for weekly paid employees. The results of the ABS survey of a sample of employees from a sample of Government agencies were 7.2, 6.8, and 7.5 days/FTE/year respectively.

The annual cost to the department of sick leave over the period 1 July 1985 to 31 December 1988 equates to about \$500 000 in terms of mid-1989 dollars.

Sick leave periods of a single day or less accounted for 40 per cent of all leave. Any excess of this leave being taken in conjunction with a weekend or public holiday was found to be marginal. Sick leave periods of 15 days or more accounted for over 12 per cent of all leave.

The department's work force is, on average, significantly older than the South Australian work force in general; for example, 20.2 per cent of the department is over 55 compared with 8.1 per cent for the total South Australian work force. Specific areas of apparently excess usage of sick leave have been identified. These relate to the 15 to 19 age group and 59 to 64 age bracket. These may warrant specific action plans being developed by management. I now ask the Director of the Department of Marine and Harbors to provide details of his salary.

Mr Phipps: My salary is \$86 522, to the nearest \$10 or so, and I do not receive any allowances in addition to salary.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: At the moment, we have 92.5 executive officers and administrative officers, distributed as 13.5 in administration and finance, 37 in engineering, four in commercial, nine in executive positions and 29 in port operations. We will advise the Committee later of the separate figures for EOs and AOs. I refer the member for Bragg to program 8 in the Estimates of Payments (page 182). Under 'Intra-agency Support Service Items not Allocated to Programs' for salaries, wages and related payments the actual payments last financial year totalled \$6.363 million, the proposed allocation for 1989-90 is \$5.514 million; for goods and services, operating and maintenance expenses, payments in 1988-89 totalled \$1.337 million and for 1989-90, \$1.436 million has been allocated; for administration

expenses, minor equipment and sundries, \$1.64 million was expended in 1988-89 and \$1.65 million has been allocated for 1989-90; for accommodation and services costs \$756 000 was spent in 1988-89 and \$761 000 has been allocated this year; for interest on borrowings, \$352 000 was expended and \$386 000 has been allocated; nothing for overseas visits of officers and for payments to consultants, \$9 000 was spent and \$10 000 has been allocated this year. There was no purchase of office machinery and equipment and none is proposed.

Mr INGERSON: That information is already available. What I would like is a further break-down if that is available.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: We will provide that information at a later date.

Mr INGERSON: I understand that the Minister said that he would supply information in relation to telephone calls. There was a fair amount of rowdiness when the Minister replied to the question about a car phone and/or a cellular phone. What were the operating costs in the past financial year and in this year to date and what was the breakdown of costs in terms of local, STD and ISD calls?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Marine and Harbors has no car phones.

Mr INGERSON: In Federal Parliament Senator Alston asked a question in November 1988 about the costing of the *Island Seaway*. In answer to Senator Button, he said that, in 1987, the amended estimate copy in relation to the Australian Customs Service was \$21.025 million. That obviously included money paid in terms of bounty. The Auditor-General's Report (page 138) states that the amount paid by the department and the Federal Government for this vessel was \$20.1 million. Why is there a difference of \$1 million in these amounts?

Mr Phipps: From what the honourable member has said, the figure quoted in Parliament identified the cost that Eglo, as a contractor, had put as its total cost to the Australian Customs Service. Eglo, in seeking bounty payments, quoted its total cost irrespective of what it was due to be paid under the contract. For example, Eglo could have claimed that its cost was any figure in excess of the contract, provided it could justify that, and the Federal Government, through Customs, would pay bounty based on Eglo's actual cost. That is a figure completely separate from what the State was bound to pay Eglo under the contractual arrangements.

The figure in the Auditor-General's Report in terms of the cost of the *Island Seaway* to the State includes the payments made to Eglo as per the requirements under the contract. That is completely separate from the actual cost that Eglo incurred. The figure of \$3.4 million referred to in the Auditor-General's Report is a figure which, under the contractual agreement, Eglo was obliged to take into account in determining how much money it should receive from the State. The bounty figure that the Australian Customs Service would have actually paid would have been in excess of that and would have been based on Eglo's actual cost, irrespective of whether Eglo made a loss, profit or whatever.

If, under the contract, Eglo was entitled to, say, \$14 million or \$15 million—and I forget the exact figures, but we have them here—there was a formula in the contract for the amount of bounty that it had to assume it was eligible for. That is an issue completely separate from how much bounty it would have actually claimed from Customs because its actual claim would have been based on its total cost.

The State of South Australia was not really interested in how much it cost Eglo to build the vessel; it was interested

only in our contractual obligations under the contract. The two are quite different. For example, if Eglo's cost exceeded the contract amount by, say, \$3 million, it would have incurred a loss of perhaps \$3 million or more on the contract, but it would get bounty for that. So, the Auditor-General's Report was referring only to the bounty figure that would have been calculated under the contractual agreement, not to payments made by the Commonwealth for all Eglo's claim.

Mr INGERSON: Page 138 the Auditor-General's Report states:

Payments relating to the costs of design, construction and modifications of the vessel amounted to \$20.1 million at 30 June 1989, representing a cost to the State of \$16.7 million after taking into account a bounty of \$3.4 million paid under Commonwealth legislation. Total payments to 30 June 1988 amounted to \$18.9 million. The final cost of the vessel is dependent upon the cost of further modifications . . .

What do the total payments refer to? There is a difference between the State component of \$16.7 million and the total amount paid, according to the Auditor-General's Report. What is the difference between the \$18.9 million and the \$16.7 million? I raise this matter because it is rather unusual for the Auditor-General to comment on Federal payments and to not note it.

Mr Phipps: The 30 June 1988 figure is consistent with the figure that was reported on in the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1988. The Auditor-General has added the total of the cheques written by the State Government to pay for the cost of the vessel and the amount of bounty that the Commonwealth paid to Eglo in relation to the actual amount that Eglo was entitled to under the contract. So, the Auditor-General has added a State payment and a Commonwealth payment to Eglo.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, if one adds the State figure of \$16.7 million and the Commonwealth figure of \$3.4 million, which the Auditor-General said was paid under Commonwealth legislation, the total is \$20.1 million as at 30 June 1989. The Auditor-General went on to say, 'Total payments as at 30 June'—the same day—'amounted to \$18.9 million.' There must be an explanation for this.

Mr Phipps: The figure for 30 June 1988 consisted of the sum total of all the cheques written by the State at that time, which was \$15.5 million, and the payment made by the Commonwealth in relation to that payment by the State to Eglo, the contractual amount. So, it is 15.5 plus the 3.4, which adds up to \$18.9 million. One year later, the sum of the cheques paid out for the vessel at that point to complete the original contract and other ancillary work was \$16.3 million. The bounty figure that Eglo was entitled to in relation to that contractual amount from the Commonwealth still stood at \$3.4 million. In addition, SAFA had advanced the department pending funding by the owner, \$400 000, in relation to the enhancement program which is presently happening at Port Adelaide: The sum of those is \$20.1 million.

Mr INGERSON: As the Minister would be aware there have been significant modifications to the vessel almost from the first day it went on the water and was in service. Can the Minister detail all the modifications and say whether some of the modifications came under guarantee, and, if not, what was the cost of those modifications?

Mr Phipps: If we split the modification into two parts for explanation, we have the current enhancement project proceeding, and there is a set of figures associated with that. Virtually all costs associated with the previous contract and related modifications were incurred before 30 June 1988. We can provide that detailed information in writing. In the

current enhancement program, we estimate the net cost of the modifications as being about \$1.125 million.

Mr TYLER: My questions are on behalf of my colleague Mr Hamilton, the member for Albert Park. Will the Minister provide details of work to be carried out on the revetment at the West Lakes waterway. Will the existing revetment work be maintained, or will an alternative work be introduced? If so, what style will be used? When will such works commence? How much will be spent this financial year? The member for Albert Park asks the Minister to provide details of maintenance, remedial or other programmed works to be carried out within or in conjunction with the West Lakes waterway operations.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The routine maintenance work will continue on the West Lakes banks and structures, and \$120 000 has been budgeted for this work in the 1989-90 financial year. However, serious deterioration of the bank protection work is evident in both the stepped revetments and the vertical retaining wall. Investigations into the methods and costs of repairing these structures is continuing, and a report is expected from the department in October of this year.

We will then determine what remedial works are most appropriate, how such works will be undertaken and over what period. No major remedial works are planned to be undertaken this year.

Mr TYLER: On 17 August 1989, the Minister responded to the member for Albert Park in relation to the third party rights of appeal for West Lakes residents by stating:

I anticipate an announcement shortly about changes to the regulations.

Is the Minister now able to give a specific time-table or approximation of when the third party rights of appeal will be introduced?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: When I responded to Mr Hamilton in respect to inquiries from constituents in the West Lakes area, we convened a meeting of the various parties to expedite the granting of third party rights of appeal of development decisions affecting West Lakes.

There were two realistic options for introducing the required changes, first, to bring the present West Lakes regulations under the Planning Act so that third party appeal will automatically apply. Other planning policy changes proposed by Delfin and the City of Woodville would then need to be implemented by the supplementary development plan process.

Secondly, the question was to amend the West Lakes regulations and bring about the other proposed planning policy changes by agreement between the Minister of Marine and Delfin, and then bring the regulations under the Planning Act. This would concurrently enable the introduction of planning policy changes and third party appeal rights. The second option is being pursued at this stage and the department previously advised that option was achievable by 30 June 1989.

The process has been delayed by change of personnel in Delfin, although final draft proposals have now been developed between the Department of Environment and Planning, Woodville, Henley and Grange councils, and Delfin. Proposed amendments to the West Lakes regulations are expected to be forwarded for consideration soon. The department is waiting on final advice from the Department of Environment and Planning in relation to introducing third party appeal rights in conjunction with bringing the West Lakes regulations under the Planning Act, incorporating some minor planning policy changes. This dual requirement can be resolved in a single procedure, and should be able to be implemented within a month or two. I will be in

a position to expedite this when my officers receive the final proposal from the Department of Environment and Planning and Delfin.

Mr TYLER: I wish to draw the Minister's attention to the Estimates of Payments (page 218). The Department of Marine and Harbors has a proposed capital allocation for harbor facilities and services of \$11.6 million, and it is split into two sections: major capital projects and actual provisions for minor works, plant machinery, etc. Can the Minister give more detail as to the projects planned to be undertaken within this allocation?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The main capital project in Port Adelaide in-berth is fire-fighting facilities to provide a fire-fighting installation to the Australian Association of Port Marine Authority guidelines, improved access for fire-fighting appliances and interconnecting product pipelines to oil company terminals as a measure to improve fire safety pending construction of a new common-user berth. That is \$2.7 million.

At Outer Harbor, 2 and 4 berths will be rebuilt to provide 100 tonne axle-load capacity wharf deck to enable operation of heavy forklifts from roll on roll off vessels at Outer Harbor 3 and 60 metres of concrete deck, and fendering at Outer Harbor 4 to ensure ability to berth two vessels at Outer Harbor once the remainder of Outer Harbor 4 becomes unserviceable. That is \$1.2 million.

Outer Harbor 6 Berth extension is to provide a short extension to the existing wharf together with isolated berthing dolphins. This would enable two ships to be berthed together and provide enough crane coverage to start working cargo on the second ship. These measures are necessary to reduce existing and unexpected queuing delays resulting from the increasing number of calls. That is \$2 million.

At Port Adelaide, there will be the replacement of old, unsafe timber berthing dolphins at M Berth. The existing structures are beyond repair and will be replaced with structures suitable for the safe berthing and mooring of present day tankers, and providing for the safety, health and welfare of mooring gang personnel. That is \$1.6 million.

Other minor projects will comprise a variety of other minor capital works necessary to maintain and improve the operating efficiency of the State's ports, comprising: Outer Harbor 6 trans ocean terminal shed extension, \$256 000; Outer Harbor 1-4 berth—new stacking area, \$393 000; navigational aids—various, \$131 000; lighting wharves/berths—various, \$77 000; Port Adelaide—Moorhouse Road drainage, \$71 000; miscellaneous carry-overs, \$170 000; Port Adelaide—computer aided drafting systems, \$100 000; electronic surveillance equipment—various, \$100 000; Wallaroo—approach jetty piling, \$192 000; automated hydrographic system, \$160 000; Thevenard—bulk loading plant support columns, \$100 000; and Outer Harbor 3 and 4 waterside worker facility amenities, \$71 000. That makes a total of \$1.821 million.

The department also has an allocation for annual provisions as follows: plant and machinery—floating, \$330 000; motor vehicles, \$560 000; general, \$350 000; stores operating costs, \$350 000; preliminary investigations, \$50 000; information systems, \$139 000; occupational health and safety, \$100 000; and minor capital projects, \$400 000. That makes a total of \$11.6 million.

Mr INGERSON: At page 138 the Auditor-General's Report states:

The cost of construction of the vessel has been financed from funds made available from the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) together with interest earned on unspent funds. To 30 June 1989, SAFA had advanced funds totalling \$16.5 million and had been repaid \$16 million following the sale of the vessel.

At 30 June, the amount outstanding to SAFA was \$3.3 million representing mainly the capitalised cost of interest incurred on funds advanced by SAFA.

Does the department intend to commence repaying that \$3.3 million capitalised debt? Has that debt been included in the cost of the vessel to June 1989 and, if not, why not?

Mr Phipps: The department's responsibility was to coordinate the construction of the vessel. The \$3.3 million financing cost referred to by the honourable member is not the responsibility of the Department of Marine and Harbors but of SAFA and the owners of the vessel. As would normally be the case in such situations, I expect that the cost will be picked up by the owners of the vessel.

Mr INGERSON: The Auditor-General says that the amount of \$3.3 million is, in essence, a debt of the Department of Marine and Harbors. That is very clearly the inference of his comment. Are you saying that that \$3.3 million is not outstanding to SAFA from the Department?

Mr Phipps: SAFA lodged funds with the Department of Marine and Harbors for the purposes of construction, and interest has accumulated in relation to that account. I have it in writing. We were the project coordinators and not the owners: the owner normally picks up the financing cost. All I can say is that I have a letter from the Under Treasurer which says that the meeting of that repayment is not the responsibility of the department but is a matter for resolution elsewhere.

Mr INGERSON: Does that \$3.3 million appear anywhere in the accounts of the department and, if not, why not, when it has been clearly brought to account, in writing at least, by the Auditor-General? It seems to me that whether or not it is owed by the owner to the department or whether it is a direct line to Treasury is of no consequence: someone owes \$3.3 million to SAFA, and the Auditor-General has clearly inferred that it is the Department of Marine and Harbors.

Mr Phipps: The honourable member has used the word 'inferred'. All that is said here is that the amount outstanding to SAFA was \$3.3 million, representing mainly the capitalised cost of interest incurred on funds advanced by SAFA. It is not in the accounts of the department as such. We have monitored the debt, but we have no control over it. A similar example would be the construction of a house. There are two components: the cost to be paid to the contractor and the financing cost associated with the funds that are drawn down. All I can do is repeat that SAFA is accepting the responsibility for handling that finance cost with the owners, and it is not a departmental responsibility.

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister obtain a report for us as to who owes SAFA the \$3.3 million?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the Under Treasurer to provide us with the information sought by the member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: Some considerable work is being done at the moment on the *Island Seaway*. Will the Minister detail the new work taking place and the design reasons for that work?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: At the moment, the two Z-pellers have been removed from the vessel and are being modified by having the centre of the propeller extended by 200 millimetres, the diameter reduced by 400 millimetres, and a nozzle fitted to the Z-drive propeller. It is also having installed an additional drive unit for directional drive of the Z-pellers, and they will then be replaced in the vessel. The motor has had its rating changed from 900 revolutions per minute to 1 000 revolutions per minute. That has meant that a limiter placed on the front of the motor has been changed, and the increased revs are needed because the diameter of the propeller has been reduced in size.

It is anticipated that the nozzle will increase power at four knots by 25 per cent. That more effective use of power is dissipated as the speed of the vessel increases. The design modifications were carried out as a result of tank testing by the Marin organisation in the Netherlands. Taking into account scale effect, the tank testing demonstrated that it did six knots into force nine, and we have seen a tape of it performing in force 10 winds with fully developed waves of five metres. That is what the alterations will do to it.

Mr INGERSON: Who undertook the design changes and have they been tank tested? If not, why not?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I thought that I had advised that the modifications had been performed as a result of tank testing.

Mr INGERSON: With respect, your reply was in answer to the previous question.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: And I said that these modifications had been undertaken as a result of tank testing. Barnes and Fleck designed the work.

Mr INGERSON: And who tank tested these design changes?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask both of you to revert to the form of question and answer through the Chair.

Mr INGERSON: My question relates to the design changes of the modifications and not the design or anything that happened prior to these modifications being requested or suggested. Who performed the design changes and have those design changes relating to the modifications been tank tested? If not, why not?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Barnes and Fleck undertook the design work and I explained earlier that the alterations were performed as a result of tank testing, which demonstrated that the vessel could proceed at 6 knots into force 9 winds and would handle quite well at force 10 winds in fully developed waves of 5 metres. That proved a design submitted by Barnes and Fleck. If the honourable member wants information about tank testing undertaken prior to the previous effort relating to the report prepared by Howard Smith, that was distributed to the Leader of the Opposition and was the subject of some press publicity at the time it was released. That brought about some restrictions on the vessel and its operation in force 6 winds. They made certain suggestions as to the design parameters, and those suggestions were accepted.

I said earlier that all those modifications were taken into account, as was scale effect. This testing is undertaken with models in test tanks. Experience has demonstrated that, whilst such a test provides a reasonably good indication, it does not always prove that it will work. I draw the member for Bragg's attention to the refitting of the QEII. Veins were placed at the rear of the vessel in order to make the power output of that vessel more efficient so that less fuel would be used. The design was tank tested but, when it arrived at New York at the end of its first journey, one was cut off and the other had fallen off during the journey, so tank testing is not always infallible taking into account scale effect. That has been done on the basis of the nozzles, the reduced propeller design and the increased revolutions.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What is the current warehousing situation in Port Adelaide?

Mr Phipps: The last major project was approximately two years ago when Elders made a major investment in wool warehousing in Port Adelaide, and that was done as a cooperative venture between the department and Elders. The objective was to ensure that as much of South Australia's production of wool as possible came to Port Adelaide in the first instance. I believe that approximately 90 per cent of South Australia's wool now comes to Port Adelaide

in the first instance. The objective behind that strategy was based on the assumption that once we have the wool in Port Adelaide, it is much easier to attract the services to Adelaide that will carry that wool. In addition, we recently carried out a study that investigated the relative warehousing costs as between the various Australian capital cities, and the conclusion of the consultants was that, for a particular distribution of goods based on the distribution of population around the country, Adelaide had some very strong warehousing advantages because of the lower property and construction costs which offset distribution costs.

Having regard to that fact, we are now proceeding further with that study to look at the economies that would be involved in distributing time sensitive cargoes from overseas. When I say 'time sensitive cargoes' I refer to cargoes that must arrive at their destinations as quickly as possible. We are studying the feasibility of developing warehousing for time sensitive cargoes from the major exporting countries to Australia. For example, if goods that are imported into Australia from Europe go to the port of Sydney and are then distributed from there, the delays in getting that cargo off the wharf in the port of Sydney can be up to eight weeks. In that situation, if such a cargo could come to Adelaide, it would be available within seven days of the ship's docking anywhere in Australia, so time sensitive cargoes would be prepared to pay the premium necessary to avoid the delays in Sydney and Melbourne. We are studying that matter in great detail and we are talking to prospective warehousing companies.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Is the Saudi Arabian dispute having an effect on the live sheep export trade from Outer Harbor?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The department is monitoring the situation with regard to bans on live sheep exports to Saudi Arabia. A local participant in the live sheep export industry views the final outcome with some optimism and believes that the problems will remain for only a short time. It appears that moves by the Federal Government may have most impact on the resurrection of this important trade with Saudi Arabia. During 1988-89 the department aimed to maintain live sheep trade volumes through the port of Adelaide and increase its market share of the trade. We are just hoping that we can continue the live sheep trade.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I refer to page 537 of the Program Estimates and to the heading 'Commercial ports and associated services'. If the move to secure direct shipping services through the port of Adelaide, in order to reverse this trend has been a successful reality, I would like to know how Outer Harbor No. 6 terminal is coping with that additional shipping and whether it is thought necessary at this stage to include any extension to Outer Harbor No. 6 by way of pontoons or an extension of the actual wharf?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The trade coming through Outer Harbor No. 6 has increased, and the projected waiting times of vessels on current trades is moving towards unacceptable levels of average waiting periods. Consequently, the department has prepared a proposal to extend No. 6 berth by approximately half the width of the berth and the associated dolphins so that we can berth two container vessels at Outer Harbor simultaneously and so that the two cranes can operate. An amount of \$2 million has been allocated in this financial year for that work. It is anticipated that it will take a while to do it. One advantage is that this berth has already been dredged. What we need to do is put in the piling. It is estimated that it will cost about \$7.3 million all up.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I read in the program somewhere that improvements to container cranes are being implemented. Can you outline what those improvements are?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is the same work for the same area because we have to move the track down a bit.

Mr INGERSON: We have obtained a report from a consulting marine engineer in Melbourne in January 1989 which states:

The effect of the suggested modifications could only be indicated after further model tests. However, it is my opinion that they will only marginally improve the situation.

That is only his opinion; that is not what I am concerned about at this stage. What I am concerned about is the rest of the comments that he made. The engineer said that the vessel had suffered an incident in service which, in essence, resulted in the vessel's broaching. He states:

Ships' staff filed the appropriate reports outlining the situation which prompted owners' agents to recommend sea testing in the world's most advanced model testing laboratory, which was carried out . . . The objectives of model testing were most comprehensively and sensibly outlined by owners' agents . . . Only two of these objectives were achieved due to lack of testing facilities at the time.

One outstanding objective was to establish the ability of the vessel to recover course head in to wind and seas while the other was to establish the ability to go about (reverse course) in likely sea and wind states. The former condition is particularly pertinent in view of the situation experienced in practice while the latter is vital, particularly as the vessel carries passengers and hence must have the capability to recover a person who has fallen overboard.

The situation has been assessed and most comprehensive, if totally irrelevant conclusions have been reached without the completion of the objectives of model testing.

Model testing was carried out using a hypothetical sea state calculated by recognised means appropriate to northern waters. The sea states were determined solely on the basis of wind induced conditions on a calm sea while the vessel is required to operate in a region where these conditions are superimposed on an already well established swell condition emanating in the Great Australian Bight. The consultants employed by owners' agents recommended one such condition to allow for the superimposition of wind induced sea state on existing swell conditions. However, the model was not tested in this condition.

Several modifications have been suggested without the benefit of the completion of the tank testing objectives and are considered by the writer to be more in the category of a palliative as opposed to a cure.

That is his professional comment. The architect clearly says in all this that any modifications need to be tank tested in conditions that apply in South Australian waters. He clearly says, having read all the reports from Marin and the reports from the owners, that the recommended tests that would have involved sea conditions similar to those in South Australia were not carried out. That is the purpose for asking why these new conditions have not been tank tested. Can the Minister say whether, in the department's opinion, it does not need to be done?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I think we will traverse the whole story. The piece of paper that the member for Bragg is reading from is a report that was prepared by a naval architect following the release of the initial report prepared by Marin on the seaworthiness of the *Island Seaway*. That report made certain assumptions on the reading of the report. Some comments were made in respect of the manoeuvring tank testing which was not done because of an inability to get into the tank. That would have taken some considerable time after being involved in the tank in which the simulated conditions of force 6 winds and 4 metre fully developed waves were undertaken.

The report also made a comment about seas experienced in the Northern Hemisphere. My advice is that the sea conditions were calculated on collection of material from the Flinders University and worked out by a company

known as Stevenson and Associates which is considered to be a leading expert in Australia on this matter.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That test was never done.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I am telling the member for Bragg what happened. Whether the architect from whom the honourable member got his advice knows whether Stevenson and Associates had done something differently; I do not know. But, our understanding is that Stevenson and Associates provided the information on weather conditions likely to be encountered by the *Island Seaway*. They obtained that information, I understand, from the Flinders University. That was a comment on the Marin report; it is quite a thick report by Steedmans, experts on the Southern Ocean. The poles have not reversed yet, so it is still the Southern Ocean, and the compass still points to the north! The report was done some time ago and was released. Earlier I answered a question from the member for Bragg, in respect of certain modifications, which were suggested by the initial Marin report and designed by Barnes and Fleck. The model was altered and tank tested.

Mr INGERSON: You did not say that actually; that is why I asked the question.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I did say it was tank tested.

Mr INGERSON: No, you didn't. That is why I asked the questions.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: Once more, if you remember, I told you that it made headway of six knots into a force 9 wind with a fully developed wave of 5 metres. If that was not tank tested, I do not know what was. It would not happen in a bath. It is too big to go in a bath; it is 20 feet long. I have seen film of it performing in a manoeuvring tank and, as I said, the modifications have taken place. We anticipate it can do all these things, but must take into account scale effect. We think it will work.

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister advise the Committee how many scheduled days has the *Island Seaway* been able to sail because of forecast sea conditions, industrial and/or other circumstances since commissioning in 1987?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: While my officers are checking that information I want to make a couple of comments. Much has been said about the reliability or otherwise of the *Island Seaway*, but comments are never made about other vessels servicing Kangaroo Island. I note that the Opposition is not calling for those vessels to be sold because they cannot operate on certain days because of extreme weather conditions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is a lot of baloney, because neither the *Troubridge* nor the *Falie* operated on a number of days. Members opposite have short memories.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The honourable member ought to take a point of order. What I have said is fact. The *Island Seaway* performs better than the *Troubridge* performed. Let me give the Committee the figures. In 18 months of use the *Island Seaway* has shipped about the same amount of cargo—I think about 73 tonnes less—in 24 fewer trips at a 20 per cent annual cheaper cost, which works out at just under \$2 million per annum in operating costs.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The honourable member wants to know exactly when the *Island Seaway* did and did not sail, and we will provide that information.

Mr INGERSON: Who makes the decision in terms of sailing? What are the principal reasons for its not sailing? Has the decision process varied since the *Island Seaway* began operating? Has the process changed in terms of deter-

mining whether or not it should sail? How does that compare with the position in respect of the *mv Troubridge*?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The master of the vessel has absolute decision-making power in respect of the *Troubridge*, the *Island Seaway*, the *Falie* or any other vessel which sails into or out of our ports or which sails around the world. The master is ultimately responsible. If anything happens to the vessel, the master is taken before a court of marine inquiry and his activities and conduct are inquired into. If he is found to have made wrong decisions, he is the person who loses his licence to operate as a master. In the case of the *Island Seaway*, as with the *Troubridge*, it is the master who makes that decision.

Mr INGERSON: Has there been any time management control by the department of the time and cost involved in the construction and design of the *Island Seaway*?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will ask the Director to respond to that question.

Mr Phipps: We have a full-time project manager and a financial/clerical officer assisting in-house on the project. I will provide the costs at a later date.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There have been statements both in the media and from the Federal Minister about waterfront reform. What is the South Australian Government doing to implement the recommendations of that waterfront strategy inquiry?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Commonwealth Government has announced a strategy for reform of the Australian waterfront. This program is closely based on the conclusions and recommendations of the interstate commission inquiry into the waterfront. Through this strategy the Commonwealth Government will pursue change in a number of areas of the waterfront, including the stevedoring industry and the port authorities. Over the next three years a fundamental change will occur in the stevedoring industry with employment arrangements shifting from the current practice of industry-wide employment to enterprise-based employment for stevedoring labour. Negotiations between the employers and the unions for an in-principle agreement to implement this reform are under way with an end September timescale for agreement on:

The introduction of enterprise employment arrangements, including enterprise-based flexible supplementary work force arrangements, in the major capital city ports.

The restructuring of awards and agreements in accordance with the structural efficiency principle of the 1988 National Wage Case decision.

A one-off special retirement and redundancy scheme for 3 000 existing stevedoring employees and a recruitment program to bring 1 000 new waterside workers no older than 30 directly into individual enterprises.

The phasing out, over the next three years, of the existing subsidies for stevedoring labour costs in the regional, intermediate and small ports. This will require the introduction of measures to improve the efficiency of these ports through revised employment arrangements including enterprise employment, commercial labour pools and the use of integrated port labour forces.

It is proposed that the cost of the retirement and redundancy package, which will cost up to \$290 million, and of improving training facilities, training of new recruits and retraining of existing employees, which will cost up to \$16 million, be funded by the Government and the employers on a dollar for dollar basis.

Current industry arrangements regarding compulsory redundancy for existing employees will be retained. The

permanent inclusion of stand-down provisions in awards will be left as a matter to be pursued through normal industrial relations commission processes. Employment arrangements for the stevedoring of bulk cargoes will be in accordance with efficient operational requirements.

The Commonwealth Government has endorsed the broad thrust of the interstate commission's recommendations for improving the efficiency and transparency of port authority operations. The issues identified include:

Port authority efficiency will be best achieved by commercialising their operations through being put on a business-like basis as far as possible.

Port pricing practices need to be modified to reduce cross-subsidies and reliance on cargo-based charges and to ensure greater transparency in port pricing and a closer relationship between costs and services provided.

Port authorities should take a more pro-competitive approach within their ports. In particular, port authorities should play a central role in encouraging a more competitive environment for services such as stevedoring and towage in their ports through leases and licensing arrangements.

The South Australian Department of Marine and Harbors, in common with other major port agencies throughout Australia, has embarked on an intensive program of change consistent with these proposals. In particular, the department's program of commercialisation incorporates the following elements:

Reporting of performance on a commercial basis including adoption of business unit reporting.

Asset review and rationalisation.

Pricing structure review.

Overheads analysis.

Introduction of profitability goals.

Work force and organisation restructuring on a strategic business unit basis. Port Adelaide and the regional ports will operate as two separate business divisions focusing on customer service and profitability. The support divisions will also operate as internal businesses.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: What is the anticipated general rate increase in departmental charges for the 1989-90 financial year? What factors have been taken into account in arriving at that increase, if there is to be one?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The bulk of the revenue of the Department of Marine and Harbors stems from charges for wharfage, tonnage rates, conservancy dues and pilotage levied on shipping and cargo pursuant to the Harbors Act. Over recent years it has been the practice to review these port charges on an annual basis to enable tariff increases to be contained to a manageable level. As from October 1989, charges for wharfage, pilotage, conservancy dues and some minor charges will increase by 4.5 per cent, while charges for tonnage rates will remain constant. The retention of tonnage rates at their present level effectively means that shipping charges (that is, pilotage, conservancy dues and tonnage rates) will increase only by a weighted average of 2.5 per cent. In approving these rate increases, several factors were taken into account, including:

extent of cost recovery;

consumer price index increases;

the competitive position of interstate ports and thus the level of their charges;

economic factors relating to individual commodities; and

the views of the South Australian Chamber of Shipping, the South Australian Shipping Users Group and the South Australian Ports Liaison Advisory Committee. These

groups considered that the increases were at an acceptable and responsible level.

The department's rate increases over the past several years have been contained well below the inflation rate. In the recent Program Estimates and Information 1989-90 publication the department indicated that its charges in real terms have actually decreased by minus 2.6 per cent in the 1987-88 financial year and minus 4.8 per cent in the 1988-89 financial year. The rate increase will attract additional revenue of \$812 000 in the 1989-90 financial year and \$1.218 million in a full year.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Did the department break even in its commercial operations for the 1988-89 financial year as planned?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It did not make a profit; it made a surplus, and I would have thought that, as a businessman, you would understand the difference. Although the department's objective was to break even on commercial operations it achieved a surplus of \$1.85 million for the 1988-89 financial year. This is a \$3.7 million improvement on the 1987-88 result. The most significant factor to which this improved result was attributed was an increase in revenue of \$3.6 million to a total of \$44.31 million. This increase was the result of a general rate increase of only 4 per cent effective from 1 October 1988, which accounts for \$1.11 million. The balance (that is, \$2.49 million) is the result of the increased trade throughput achieved for the year, particularly on non-grain bulk commodities and container related revenue increases.

Total 1988-89 expenditure for the department decreased by \$119 000 from the level incurred in the 1987-88 financial year. This decrease represented real savings by the department of approximately 7.8 per cent when the influence of CPI increases are taken into account. Significant factors that contributed to the expenditure level being reduced between the two financial years included: the rationalisation and transfer of assets and associated debt. This had the impact of maintaining the level of interest payments, even though the average interest rate increased significantly over the year; and the implementation of efficiency measures and budgetary savings programs that had been adopted, which offset the increase in salaries, wages, goods and services due to inflationary factors.

The final surplus from commercial operations equates to a 1.9 per cent return on assets valued at written down historical cost.

Mr INGERSON: When does the Minister expect the service to Kangaroo Island to be resumed and when does the Minister expect the service to continue on to Port Lincoln, and, if he does not expect it to so continue, why not? I understand that the responsibility for this has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Harbors.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Kangaroo Island service is scheduled to resume on Monday week. The operation of the Port Lincoln service will be negotiated between the operators of the vessel, the Seamen's Union and the Merchant Service Guild.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, am I to understand from that that the Government has no intention of becoming involved as a partner in those negotiations? I am not implying that the Government should wield a big stick, but does the Government intend to become involved in that essential service between Port Lincoln and Kangaroo Island, particularly now that an abattoir has opened on Kangaroo Island, supported very strongly by the State Government and the State Development team?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: This is a matter for the operators; they operate the vessel and we expect that they will be successful in achieving trips to Port Lincoln.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I acknowledge the Minister's efforts in answering the member for Bragg and to make every reasonable attempt to lift the credibility of the *Island Seaway*. I understand that his effort is reflected in his persistent comments about the vessel's capacity to perform and, more especially, the capacity to carry larger loads in tonnage than predecessors. Does the Minister recognise in this general effort to promote the credibility of the vessel that tonnage loadings on the *Island Seaway* or, indeed, on any other vessel that has operated to Kangaroo Island over the years, are determined largely by seasonal demands, broad-acre land development trends and other factors and are quite unrelated to the credibility of the ship or ships that may be trading there in the meantime?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Minister accepts that, if there were no agricultural or industrial activity on Kangaroo Island, there would be no need for a cargo vessel to go there. The Minister accepts that, because of the commercial activity on that island, there is a need for vessels to carry cargo to and from the island. My comments on the *Island Seaway* are intended as a comparison with the *Troubridge*; over an 18-month period, when it has carried the same amount of cargo, it has taken 24 fewer trips, with 20 per cent less cost, because the annual cost of operating the *Troubridge* was over \$5 million, and the cost of operating the *Island Seaway* is about \$3 million. It means that carriage of goods to Kangaroo Island is cheaper than if they were carried by the *Troubridge*.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I do not know of anyone who has disputed in any way the cost of operation for the Government or the current owners of the *Island Seaway*, but I am acutely aware of the ever-increasing costs to the consumers and users of that vessel, and I am currently concerned about those costs on behalf of that constituency than about the operational costs that might be incurred by the owners. My second question relates to the promoted loading capacities of the vessel and, quite frankly, I find the repeated utterings of the Minister in this respect quite fallacious and meaningless in the context of providing a service to Kangaroo Island. I cite an example of how synthetic this exercise of rating the tonnages and the carrying capacities is. When the War Service Land Settlement Scheme was at its height on Kangaroo Island 30 years ago, ships like the *Karaka*, the *Kapoola*, the *Warrawee*, the steamship *Karatta*, the *Parndarna* and, ultimately, the *m.v. Troubridge*, carried superphosphate tonnages to Kangaroo Island exceeding tonnages ever since. It just so happens that, immediately after the commissioning of the *Island Seaway* a couple of years ago, the wool price increased substantially in the subsequent year, and again last year, and this has enabled the 450 farmers to buy increased tonnages of superphosphate.

It, being a heavy dead load with a high opportunity for maximising the loading capacity of the ship, has caused the tonnages carried on the *Island Seaway* to dramatically increase in its first two years since commissioning as against the last two years of the operation of the *m.v. Troubridge*. Frankly, those comparisons, tonnages, amounts and respective capacities of the ships are quite meaningless to the exercise of providing a service to Kangaroo Island. So, too, is it quite meaningless to talk about what might be carried in the next 12 months, remembering that although the new industrial operation at the abattoir on Kangaroo Island is now killing—when it has gas to operate—in the region of

a thousand sheep a day, most of those sheep would have ordinarily been deported off the island alive.

Next year, one can anticipate that the tonnages carted off Kangaroo Island will be significantly less than they were for the 12 months immediately past when sheep were deported from Kangaroo Island direct to domestic markets and the Middle East. The peaks and troughs associated with tonnages moving on to and off Kangaroo Island are determined by those other factors and not by the capacity of the ship to carry such loads.

It is important that the Minister recognises that point, and equally important that he and his department, which is now in charge of this service to Kangaroo Island, recognise that the cost to the owners of the vessel, albeit locked into a formula of cost recovery charging to the consumer, has absolutely no bearing on the price paid by the consumer on the island, whether or not the ship is fully loaded, or whether the vessel runs more cheaply this year than she does next year, or the other way around. The linear foot charges to the vehicle operators who use that vessel are static, except for the formula of increased charging that is set by the Crown which the community is committed to pay.

To talk about it being cheaper to cart goods to or from Kangaroo Island this year than it was last year, or last year than it was the year before, is absolute nonsense. It may be cheaper for the operator; less subsidy may be involved for the Government; but, as far as the consumers on Kangaroo Island are concerned, it is getting dearer every six months, when the calculations are adjusted at CPI plus 10 per cent per annum. I put to this Committee that it is reaching a point where it is fast becoming beyond the capacity of those consumers to meet the costs involved. Can the Minister give any information about any alternative form of sea-linking transport that may be in the pipeline that he is aware of for servicing the island community, in relation to passenger, vehicular and heavy transport carrying?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I take issue with the member for Alexandra with respect to costs. It might irk the member for Alexandra to know that the *Island Seaway* is a cheaper vessel to operate than the *Troubridge*. It might also irk the member for Alexandra to know that on 20 fewer trips the *Island Seaway* carted approximately the same amount of material as the *Troubridge* did in the 12 months—

Mr S.J. BAKER interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I listened to what the member for Alexandra had to say in complete silence although I do not agree with a lot of what he said, and he has peddled it around before. The member for Mitcham can wait his turn to ask questions, and I will answer them then. Perhaps I was wrong in relation to 20 trips. In public I have been using figures that relate to 18 months. In 20 months the *Island Seaway* did 256 trips and carted 192 302 tonnes. In its last 20 months the *Troubridge* did 310 trips and carted 192 388 tonnes. The report prepared by Marin went into some detail about the operations of the vessel and also stated that the vessel was cheaper to operate in relation to payments per annum to the crew and for fuel, and consequently there was a saving.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister is entitled to a fair go in his reply.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The *Island Seaway* is cheaper to operate for the State and for the people on the island. In relation to other vessels that might operate, there is a proposal to operate a high speed catamaran carrying 400 people from a facility near the Patawalonga outlet to Kingscote. We have recently been made aware of a proposal to operate

a ferry service from Cape Jervis to Penneshaw. They are proposals; nothing hard has as yet been put to the Government.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: We have talked about the carrying capacity, in freight terms, of the various vessels. Will the Minister provide now, or at his earliest convenience, the number of passengers carried in the best year of the *Island Seaway* operation as against the best year of the vessel's predecessor?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I draw members' attention to the fact that, when the *Island Seaway* was first proposed under the Tonkin Government, it was proposed as a cargo vessel only, and is designed primarily as a cargo not a passenger vessel. However, it does have some passenger carrying capacity. I will provide that answer on notice, and also draw some other comparisons between passenger-carrying on the sea between Kangaroo Island and the mainland of South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Program Estimates (page 529), states:

Recreational boating is significant and expanding recreational outlet for the public.

It points out that boats registered under the Boating Act are increasing at 1.3 per cent, and they now total 47 510. Is the Minister aware of that trend in recreational boating requirements? What does the Government propose in order to meet that emerging and important aspect of boating activity in South Australia?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I agree with the member for Mitchell that the provision of launching facilities for the boating public in South Australia is very important. It was only last month that the member for Alexandra and I were at the opening of a vastly improved boat ramp at American River, the majority of funds being supplied by the Department of Marine and Harbors out of its small boating facilities fund, Tourism South Australia and the Dudley District Council. Whilst work on the seaward side is still to be finished, the Dudley District Council has undertaken the work and done a fine job. This year, we plan to spend \$58 000 at Billy Lights Point boat ramp. That is a cost-sharing boat ramp improvement with the Port Lincoln council. We will be spending \$16 000 on the boat ramp improvement at American River.

There will be \$50 000 in upgrading of navigational aids, which is the department's continuing policy of upgrading navigational aids for the safe use of South Australian workers by the recreational boating public. The Port Hughes boat ramp will cost \$50 000, and that is a contribution of the District Council of Northern Yorke Peninsula for the construction of a new boat ramp. Also, \$46 000 will be spent on upgrading the existing boat ramp at Outer Harbor, and \$30 000 will be spent on the boat ramp at Point Turton. That is a contribution by the District Council of Warooka towards the boat ramp upgrading, and represents \$250 000 worth of work.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Referring to the same page, I note that the department sees performance indicators as being of value. They show that between 1986-87 and 1988-89 there has been a change from 45 940 to 47 000 in the number of boats concerned in the recreational area. That is quite an increase—510. Does the Minister believe that that is the only criterion which should be used in relation to requirements that the State ought to meet for that area? Clearly, there is an obvious increase in the number of boats concerned. I heard what the Minister said about some of his proposals for increased facilities in that area. Are there any other criteria at which the Minister looks in relation to what the State might be called on to provide in that area?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: That is a fairly important matter. The broad objectives and goals of the department relate to safe boating practices. The department has been able to prepare a program of instruction on boating safety for distribution in schools. A program has been developed in conjunction with the South Australian Film Corporation and the Department of Technical and Further Education.

I also draw attention to page 532, which indicates the reported incidents in the years referred to by the member for Mitchell. There were 37 in 1986-87, 42 in 1987-88, and 40 in 1988-89. Deaths are reported at four in 1986-87, five in 1987-88, and seven in 1988-89. Injuries are reported at 10 in 1986-87, 18 in 1987-88, and 28 in 1988-89. We regard those as fairly significant trends and, with the new issue of licences and registrations from October this year, we will be issuing a safety pamphlet setting out pertinent points on safety operations of small boats. They will be issued with the licence and registration renewal notices to the people who are registered with the Department of Marine and Harbors in the small boating area.

Boating Act amendments were passed in November 1988. Members will recall that debate when the Opposition moved to introduce breath testing for boat operators who were suspected of committing serious boating offences. That amendment was accepted by the Government. The amendments also provided changes to motor boat registration procedures, including the introduction of transfer registration, the provision of regulations governing construction standards and operators of hire and drive vessels, increased penalties for offences under the Act, and provisions for police breath testing for boat operators suspected of committing serious boating offences. All provisions are expected to come into operation at the beginning of next month.

All these amendments are designed to improve boating safety. The analogy I constantly cite relates to a motor vehicle driver who can park a vehicle, get out and walk away from it if something happens. However, it is very difficult to walk away from a vessel out at sea.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In the 1988-89 specific targets/objectives on page 529 of the Program Estimates it states that the department undertook dredging of the O'Sullivan's Beach marina and that there were improvements to boating facilities at American River, Port Minlacowie, Port Neill, Encounter Bay, Marion Bay, Point Turton, and Billy Lights Point. Page 529 also states that this increased program of activity accounted for the increase in expenditure from that level incurred in 1987-88. What does the Government and the Minister propose in relation to further improvement of the facilities available to the South Australian boating fraternity in the year under consideration? I declare my specific interest in the matter. I am very concerned about what is happening on Yorke Peninsula, especially at Stansbury where substantial improvements have been effected.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I have already answered this question. Work will be continued at Billy Lights Point (which is at Port Lincoln); navigational aids will be upgraded at American River; and boat ramps will be erected at Port Hughes, Outer Harbor and Point Turton. The boating facilities improvements cost \$180 000.

Mr INGERSON: I would like to ask a question in relation to recreational fishing at Port Giles and from the jetty at Wallaroo. It is my understanding that there has been some cessation of recreational fishing at Port Giles during working hours and also during the time at which vessels are at the jetty. It has also been put to me that similar conditions may be applied to fishing at Wallaroo. Can the Minister advise whether that is so and whether the depart-

ment is, investigating the use of jetties for recreational fishing?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The matter raised by the member for Bragg raises a fairly important point. Employees of the department who work on the Port Giles jetty sometimes have difficulty moving along that jetty because of the fishing activities by people fishing on it. They have been assaulted and abused for wanting people to move their fishing gear. In terms of occupational safety and health implications I agree with the ban on fishing from that jetty when work is in progress involving the loading of vessels. Departmental employees should not have to put up with abuse from people fishing when those employees are at work and it is not my idea of safety to have people fishing off a jetty when a vessel is loading. The workers' lives would be placed in danger.

At Wallaroo a departmental employee was placed in an invidious position because of the activities of a person who was fishing on the jetty. However, the department is investigating and will engage an outside consultant to review public access and safety on the property of the Department of Marine and Harbors, including jetties. This review is deemed appropriate in light of representations made by the Port Adelaide Security Committee regarding an incident which involved DMAH staff and members of the public who impeded progress of normal port operations. In respect of the Port Adelaide Security Committee, it has been said by those people that when vessels are being loaded, it is most inappropriate to have members of the public generally moving about those vessels and fishing.

I can recall attending at number 2 dock when, as a union organiser, I consulted with a member of a union of which I was an official whilst people were moving steel around on a fork truck. His advice to me was to move very quickly, because the fork truck was doing a half turn with 40 feet of steel on the fork. One does not need much of an imagination to know what would happen with 40 feet of steel; it can move very quickly at the extremity. If I had not moved I would have copped a whack in the legs which would have been painful and consequently damaging.

There is also the matter of public liability. The department will not place itself in a position where somebody can complain after being injured. The department was at fault for allowing them on the jetty when there was a dangerous operation in progress. So all of these matters are being investigated and when we have a consultant's report, we will consider our action in respect of that. The jetties at Wallaroo and Port Giles were built for loading grain, not for people to fish from. The department will load grain from those jetties first and, when no work is being carried out on those jetties, the public is free to fish from them. If anybody wants to drive to Wallaroo or Port Giles to fish, they should first make inquiries of the Department of Marine and Harbors to ascertain when they can fish there.

Mr INGERSON: Supplementary to that, when is this report expected to be available?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In approximately three months, but it is not something that the department is pursuing with great and immediate vigour.

Mr INGERSON: My next question relates to what appears to be a possible transfer of functions of the Department of Marine and Harbors. It is my understanding that there have been discussions over at least 12 months with the Department of Lands for the transfer of control of the Murray River from the Department of Marine and Harbors to the Department of Lands. I have been advised recently that the Recreational Boating Advisory Committee has had considerable discussions with the Department of Environment and

Planning in terms of where it should be located. Is responsibility for these recreational boating functions relating to the Murray River and to boating generally on our coast to be transferred to another department?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I refer first to the Murray River. The department presently approves mooring jetties along the river from the point of view of maritime safety. This applies along the length of the Murray River except in the Goolwa area, where the authority to approve and manage mooring structures is delegated wholly to the local council. The department also maintains a surveillance operation over existing structures to ensure that they continue to comply with marine safety aspects. The department charges a licence fee of \$10 per annum for this service. This fee is well below the cost of providing the service. For efficiency reasons and to improve customer service, options are being explored with the Department of Lands on how to provide a 'one stop shop' type service covering all aspects of structures and river access.

Final proposals are still under investigation. I draw the attention of the member for Bragg to the fact that this is a recommendation of the report on the use of the Murray River and it makes much sense as far as I am concerned. Members of the public who want to use mooring and jetty facilities built on the Murray could go to one place instead of having to go to four places. As to the transfer of the small boating facilities on the coast to the Department of Environment and Planning, as Minister I have not been made aware of any proposals. I know that an officer of the Department of Environment and Planning has talked for years about the transfer of those facilities to the department because of its involvement in coast protection. However, I have a personal view that will be used within the Government if and when this matter arises. My view is that, as the Department of Marine and Harbors has the appropriate engineering facilities for building structures involving the sea, that is where the responsibility should lie.

Mr INGERSON: As a supplementary question, does the Minister refer not only to construction but also to the maintenance of advisory committees and the direct involvement of councils, particularly as it relates to recreational boating.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I recently wrote to all the identifiable yachting and boating clubs advising them of my intention to expand the Small Boating Advisory Panel to include three representatives of the boating fraternity: one from the boating industry; one from the yachting area; and one from the power boating section, plus a representative of local government to advise me on how money ought to be spent in this area.

Mr INGERSON: My last question relates to a question asked in Parliament three or four weeks ago about the cartage of LPG to Kangaroo Island. I understand that a committee was set up to discuss the matter involving the department, the carriers and people on the island. Has that committee met and what discussions, if any, have taken place? Where are we at in terms of cartage of bulk LPG to Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: LPG is presently transported in bottles aboard the *Island Seaway* to Kangaroo Island. The commissioning of the abattoirs has created a demand for additional gas on the island. Planning for the abattoirs indicated a need for 1.7 tonnes per week. This was a miscalculation on the abattoirs part, as the need is for about 8 tonnes per week. Howard Smith Industries has been advised of the proposed specifications for the safe carriage of LPG in bulk and has been requested to inform those interested in supplying LPG to the island. At the request of the abat-

toirs, the Acting Director, Ports and Marine Operations, attended a meeting at Kingscote on 5 September 1989 to discuss the carriage of LPG in bulk. Esso and Associates, the Kangaroo Island Transport Committee, the abattoirs management and the South Australian Manager from Patrick Agencies were also present. The meeting was informed that there is an urgent need for the carriage of bulk LPG to the island. Esso indicated it wished to use a 20 tonne capacity tank for transport. The Acting Director, Ports and Marine Operations, advised the meeting of the proposed specifications for the safe carriage of this product and invited Esso and Associates to submit proposals to Howard Smith Industries and the Department of Marine and Harbors.

The abattoir indicated that it was aiming to provide solutions within one month, by 5 October 1989. Howard Smith Industries (Sydney) and the Department of Marine and Harbors are continuing investigations into the safe transport of bulk LPG at sea. I might add that this is not a light matter, as some members have made of it, because LPG is a fairly dangerous material to carry. I have recently seen photographs of the results of an explosion of LPG containers, and they literally demolished buildings within the immediate vicinity. When a safe means of carting it in accordance with international codes of marine safety in the carriage of dangerous goods has been developed, it will be carried.

Mr TYLER: My question relates to recreational boating, recognising that it is becoming a very important, significant and expanding recreational outlet for our community, particularly as the community is getting more leisure time. At page 532, the Program Estimates refer to minimising boating accidents by way of public education and the promotion of safe boating practices. I know that the Minister gave some indication to the member for Mitchell about that public education program, but how is it possible to communicate directly with the average boatie, who may not be involved in or attend association meetings?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is quite simple. Regular contact is made with all people who own vessels; they are required to renew the registration on their boats, and, when the notifications of renewal are forwarded to these people, appropriate safety literature will be included. Our department has a safety stand and exhibition at all boat shows. We have been able to negotiate an arrangement with one of the boating shows on radio, and a segment is devoted to boating safety. We think that, with this gradual process and the possible upgrading of material which the department sends out with renewal notices, all people with licences or registrations will be contacted.

Mr TYLER: I note that the number of incidents reported decreased while injuries and deaths increased from the previous year. The deaths are related to five incidents. Has the Minister any detail of where those incidents occurred? Were they on a river or at sea?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: I will have to take that question on notice as the detail is not available at the moment. The information will be in our annual report when it is published, but I will also supply it to the Committee.

Mr TYLER: What is the extent of training and development being undertaken in the department, and what is the future direction of the department's training program?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The Department of Marine and Harbors corporate training and development plan is an increasingly important component of work force planning. The plan was developed based on training needs analyses and with input from managers and from training and development committees including a training and development steering committee. During 1988-89, 847 GME Act employ-

ees and 1 045 weekly paid employees attended 87 different training modules or courses.

Many of these were conducted on a multiple basis, and this was double the previous year's effort. GME Act employees accumulated 6 910 hours of training and weekly paid employees accumulated 6 700 hours of training, making a total of 13 610 hours. This equates to an average training exposure of 19.8 hours per employee.

Based on an average employee charge-out rate of \$14.80 per hour, this represents a participant wages/salary component of \$201 400. Training and development expenditures total \$445 000 which represents 2.3 per cent of the department's budgeted gross wages and salaries. The department supported 17 employees who participated in formal studies during 1988 and a further 17 employees during 1989 under the part-time education assistance scheme.

During 1988-89 the department provided increased support to the Education Department's work experience program. The department made available work experience placements for 55 students, this being a 25 per cent increase in placements over the previous financial year. The placements were generally of one week's duration. Coordination of work experience placements and monitoring of trade school progress for the department's trade apprentices was incorporated into the responsibilities of the department's training and development staff during the year. Apprentices were provided with greater opportunity to gain a wider trade skills base. Enlargement of the skills base was facilitated through job rotation within the department and by arranged placements in other Government departments and private enterprise.

The Department of Marine and Harbors is progressing towards a commercial public sector enterprise style of operation in 1989-90. This, together with the requirements of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, award restructuring, risk management strategies and skills enhancement programs, indicates a clear requirement for the commitment to training and development activities to continue into the foreseeable future. The challenge of achieving greater outputs with fewer resources, of providing excellence in customer service and greater efficiency, has ramifications on the maintenance of a continued high level of training and development. Employees will require retraining, upgrading of skills, improved technology literacy and enhanced social skills. We will provide a statistical list of the number of persons attending various courses in 1987-88 and 1988-89.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Has any assessment been made of the damage that last week's storm did to our recreational coastal jetties? What is the estimated damage, if there is any, and when will work be carried out to rectify it?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: The only damage that the Director of Engineering Services is aware of was to the Brighton jetty. I think the repairs have already been made, and at most it will cost a couple of thousand dollars.

Mr INGERSON: For the first time the Auditor-General's Report includes a significant interest bill in relation to the Lincoln Cove marina development and the Australian Submarine Corporation. What is the significant interest bill in changed financing arrangements in relation to Lincoln Cove? What vital infrastructure is needed for the Australian Submarine Corporation?

Mr Travers: That is the way the accounting has been done with Treasury this year. What has happened is that where it can, Treasury has reallocated the interest expenditure of the Government to agencies. It was stated earlier that the department is responsible for managing the project development of the Australian Submarine Corporation and,

when it was going, the Lincoln Cove marina development. In pure accounting terms, what has occurred this year is that Treasury has allocated that interest to the Department of Marine and Harbors and it shows up for the first time in this year's annual report.

Mr INGERSON: On a supplementary question, what essential infrastructure had to be supplied to the Australian Submarine Corporation? In essence, what has been done?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: In the past financial year, the deed dated 12 May 1987 between the Premier and the Australian Submarine Corporation included an incentive package to the Australian Submarine Corporation, in the event that the company was successful in being awarded a contract by the Commonwealth for the construction of submarines and associated support requirements of the Royal Australian Navy. The incentive package stated that the State would provide, at no cost to the Australian Submarine Corporation, such roads, stormwater drainage, electrical, water and sewer services to the site as may be reasonably required to effectively and efficiently use the site for its intended purposes.

The total Cabinet approval for the provision of these services is \$3.061 million. The actual cost to 30 June 1989 totalled \$2.298 million and include the following amounts: roadworks, \$659 000; stormwater drainage, \$887 000; electrical supply, \$193 000; water sewerage, \$471 000; and design and administration, \$88 000. The budget allocation for the 1988-90 financial year is \$500 000, comprising: beach road construction, \$290 000; landscaping, \$175 000; and administration, \$35 000.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to boating safety generally, boating licences are currently granted following a written examination. It has been put to me that a practical examination should be involved. It is argued by many that, whilst it is very similar to what is required in relation to drivers'

licences for motor vehicles, there is a significant difference in the ability to control a boat as opposed to a motor vehicle. Is the department considering a practical examination as an option as part of the future licensing procedure for small boats?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: At this stage, practical tests are given for youths between the age of 12 and 16 years. It is not envisaged, because of the significant increase in costs of operating such a system, to provide practical tests for people seeking licences to operate vessels in accordance with the Boating Act. Further, I am not aware of receiving any requests from any of the boating organisations that such procedures should happen. However, if the department and the Government were to receive such requests from boating organisations, they would seriously consider the matter.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Referring to Estimates of Payments (page 182), program 7, 'Assistance to Commercial Fishing Industry', I note that the vote for 'Goods and services—operating and maintenance expenses' has risen from \$393 148 to \$417 000. If one checks with 'salaries, wages and related payments', one sees that the figure is more than one would expect. Is that a further example of assistance to the commercial industry? Is some special program involved?

The Hon. R.J. Gregory: It is an inflationary increase in the cost of providing that service to the fishing industry. I also remind members that the cost of providing safety services to the fishing industry involves a Government subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the votes completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.55 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 14 September at 11 a.m.